```
1
                           UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                          DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
 2
                           CIVIL ACTION NO. 83-2864 SA
 3
    ANTONIO CIPOLLONE, individually
    And as Executor of the Estate of
    ROSE D. CIPOLLONE,
 5
                Plaintiff,
                                         Deposition of:
          VS.
 7
                                        HAROLD H.
                                         KASSARJIAN
   LIGGETT GROUP, INC., A
    Delaware corporation; PHILIP
    MORRIS INCORPORATED, a Virginia
    Corporation; LOEW'S THEATRES,
   INC., a New York corporation,
10
11
                Defendants.
12
13
          TRANSCRIFT of testimony as taken by and
14
    before MARGARET J. TEILHABER, a Certified
    Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the States
    of New York and New Jersey, at the offices of
17
18
    WEBSTER & SHEFFIELD, 237 Fark Avenue, New York,
19
    New York, on Wednesday, October 28, 1987.
20
    APPEARANCES:
21
          BUDD LARNER GROSS PICILLO ROSENBAUM
22
          GREENBERG & SADE
          150 John F. Kennedy Parkway
23
          Short Hills, New Jersey 07078
          BY: MARC Z. EDELL, ESQ.
24
          For the Plaintiff
25
```

```
APPEARANCES: (Continued)
1
 2
          WEBSTER & SHEFFIELD
          237 Park Avenue
          New York, New York 10017
 3
                 JAMES H. GIANNINOTO, ESQ.
                 TREVOR O'NEILL, ESQ.
 4
          For Liggett Group, Inc.
 5
          SHOOK, HARDY & BACON
 6
          20th Floor
          Mercantile Bank Tower
          1101 Walnut
          Kansas City, Missouri 6410
BY: STEVEN C. PARRISH, ESQ.
                                   64106
 3
          For Philip Morris, Inc. and Lorillard, Inc.
 9
          BROWN, CONNERY, KULP, WILLE,
          PURNELL & GREENE
10
          Parkade Building
          518 Market Street
11
          P.O. Box 1449
          Camden, New Jersey 08101
12
          BY: RAYMOND F. DROZDOWSKI, ESQ.
          for Philip Morris, Inc.
13
          ARNOLD & PORTER
14
          1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
          Washington, D.C. 20036
15
                 PETER K. BLEAKLEY, ESQ. THOMAS E. SILFEN, ESQ.
16
          For Philip Morris, Inc.
17
          STRYKER, TAMS & DILL
          33 Washington Street
18
          Newark, New Jersey
          BY: WILLIAM TUCKER, ESQ.
19
          For Lorillard, Inc.
20
21
    ALSO PRESENT:
           Michele Brown
22
23
24
25
```

| | | | 3 |
|-----|---------------|--|-----------------------|
| 1 | | . INDEX | • |
| 2 | WITNESS | | DIRECT |
| 3 | HAROLD H. KAS | EARJIAN - | |
| 4 | By Mr. Ede: | 11: | 4 |
| 5 | _ | | |
| 6 | | EXHIBITS | |
| | | | |
| 7 | NUMBER | DESCRIPTION | <u>identification</u> |
| 8 | Kassarjian-i | Article entitled | 34 |
| 9 | | Cognitive Dissona and Consumer Beha | |
| 10 | Kassarjian-2 | Excerpts of depos | |
| 11 | | of Joel Cohen tak August 19, 20 and | en on . 21, |
| 12 | | 1987 | · |
| | Kassarjian-3 | Document entitled | |
| 13 | | and Tactics in Ci Advertising, 1938 | |
| 14 | | Technical Report | on |
| 15 | | Methods and Measu Richard W. Pollay | |
| 16 | | Sunner 1987 | |
| 1.0 | Kassarjian-4 | Document entitled | |
| 17 | | and factics in Ci advertising, 1938 | |
| 18 | | Technical Report | on |
| 19 | | Methods and Measu (Revised), July 9 | |
| | _ | | • |
| 20 | Kassarjian-5 | Xerox of ten ciga advertisements | rette 234 |
| 21 | W | 1-page vita and c | over page 254 |
| 22 | Kassarjian-6 | 1-page vita and c | over page 256 |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | • | |
| | | | |
| 25 | | | |

1 2 [DELETED] 3 sworn. DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. EDELL: Dr. Kassarjian, my name is Marc 7 I'm an attorney. I represent the plaintiff. Have you ever been deposed before? 9 Yes. Do you understand the nature and 10 11 purpose of a deposition? 12 Yes, I do, more or less. 13 Did you have an opportunity and did you speak with any of the lawyers representing the 14 defendants in this case? 15 I've talked to them but not on the nature 16 17 and purpose of a deposition. 18 Let me just give you some ground rules so that we all at least have some basic 19 20 understanding of what's going to happen here today. I'll ask you some questions concerning 21 your background, your opinions, your experience, 22 some of your papers. If any of my questions are 23 unclear, if you don't understand them, they don't

make any sense, tell me and I'll try to rephrase

wags and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| | Kassarjian - direct | 5 |
|----|--|-----|
| | • | |
| 1 | the question. If you don't recall a fact or if | |
| 2 | you don't know the facts which would be responsi | v e |
| 3 | to a question, tell me because we are going to | |
| 4 | presume that when you answered a question that y | ou |
| 5 | understood it and you're accurately responding t | 0 |
| 6 | it. If at any point in time you want to take a | |
| 7 | break for any reason, let me know and I'll be | |
| 8 | happy to accommodate. Do you understand that | |
| 9 | everything that you and I and everyone else in | |
| 10 | this room may say will be taken down by this you | ממ |
| | • • • | |
| 11 | lady to your left who is a certified shorthand | |
| 12 | reporter and that the testimony that you give he | re |
| 13 | today can under certain circumstances be used at | |
| 14 | the time of trial? | |
| 15 | A. Yes, I do. | |
| 16 | Q. What is your area of expertise? | |
| 17 | A. I'm a professor at the graduate school of | |
| 16 | management. I specialize in consumer behavior. | |
| 19 | Q. What is consumer behavior? | |
| 20 | A. It's the study of the behavior of | |
| 21 | individuals in the marketplace. | |
| 22 | Q. How long have you been specializing | in |
| 23 | the study of consumer behavior? | |
| | | |

24

25

```
6
    Kassarjian - direct
    consumer behavior who you recognize as experts?
 2
                I would say fifty to a hundred of
 3
    them.
                Do you know Joel Cohen?
 5
          Yes.
                Do you consider Joel Cohen to be one
 7
    of the experts in the field of consumer behavior?
                Can you tell us the purpose of content
 9
          ٥.
10
    analysis?
          It's an attempt to quantify communications
11
12
    material to categorize it and quantify so we get a
13
    better idea, better understanding of what it
14
    BEARS.
15
                What are the purposes for performing
          ٥.
    content analysis?
16
17
          There are times when you cannot ask people's
    opinions. For example, if we wanted to get an
18
19
    idea of the opinion of New Yorkers during the
    Revolutionary War, we really cannot ask Gallup to
20
    go out and do a survey so one thing we can do is a
21
22
    content analysis of letters to the editor that
    might have been written in the local newspapers.
23
    We can do a content analysis of the newspaper
24
    articles and attempt to draw conclusions or
```

```
7
    Kassarjian - direct
    assumptions about what might have been at some
    other time, so that's one possible use.
 3
    others.
          Q.
                You performed a number of content
    analyses, have you not, sir?
          Yes.
 7
                Is content analysis a recognized tool
    in the area of consumer behavior?
 9
          Yes, it is.
10
                For how long a period of time has that
    been so?
11
12
          The methodology has been there since World
13
    War II, even before World War II, but it was not
14
    picked up in consumer research and consumer
15
    behavior until the middle 1970s, early 1970s,
    about 15 years, say.
17
                Have you ever performed a content
18
    analysis with respect to advertising?
19
          Yes, I have.
                For what purpose?
20
          I wanted to see what the changing role of
21
    blacks were in our society from 1946 through 1979,
22
    I think it was.
23
24
                The use of content analysis with
25
   respect to advertising can help us decide whether
```

Kassarjian - direct or not an ad is deceptive. Is that correct? 1 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 2 3 of the question. 4 THE WITNESS: That means I can answer 5 it? 6 MR. BLEAKLEY: Yes. No, it has nothing to do with deception. 7 Content analysis can serely tell you what is 8 objectively in the message itself. Deception 9 involves perception of individuals and content 10 analysis does not measure perception of individuals. 12 Can content analysis be used to 13 ٥. determine the apparent intent of the advertising? It depends on what one means by apparent 15 intent. You can make assumptions about the intent 16 but it is not a study of the intent of the 17 communicator or the perception of the 18 interpreter. It is a study of merely what is 19 there, objectively what is there. 20 How, for example, if we see that all 21 the, every time a black appears he appears in a 22 secondary role in an ad, we can say well, it may 23 have been the intent of the advertiser or the 24 advertising agency to treat blacks as second-class

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| | 9 |
|-----|--|
| | Kassarjian - direct |
| 1 | citizens but that's not what the study is doing. |
| 2 | All the study is telling you is the role of the |
| 3 | black. |
| 4 | Q. Can a content analysis of advertising |
| 5 | reflect the appeals in advertising? |
| 6 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 7 | of the question. |
| 8 | A. If appeals means the content, the |
| 9 | substantive content of the ad, yes. If appeals |
| 0 | mean how people were influenced or the intent of |
| 1 | the creator of the ad, then no. |
| 2 | Q. Can content analysis of advertising |
| 3 | reflect the types of claims being made in the ads? |
| 4 | A. Depending on the definitions, yes. |
| 5 | Q. What definition of claims would you |
| 6 | consider to be one that would permit the content |
| 7 | analysis to reveal the types of claims being made? |
| 8 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| - | · |
| 9 | of the question. |
| 0 | A. I just don't know what the word types of |
| 1 | claims means. I'm trying to answer your question |
| 2 | and yet I don't exactly understand what you mean |
| 3 | by types of claims. |
| 4 | Q. Let me see if I can make it a little |
| _ (| 1 |

```
10
    Kassarjian - direct
    content analysis. Is that correct?
 2
          Yes, I have.
                Did you go over those papers with any
 3
    of the lawyers in this case?
          The paper you are looking at is a 1977 paper
    in the Journal of Consumer Research.
                                           In fact, I
    recognize it up upsidedown. I don't remember, I
    really don't remember talking about that paper to
    lawyers, in the recent past at least.
                Do you recall stating that the
10
11
    methodology of content analysis allows for
12
    reliable, valid and quantitative answers to
    questions such as do certain advertisers engage in
13
14
    the use of certain types of themes, appeals,
    claims or deceptive practices more than other
15
    advertisers or agencies?
16
17
    λ.
          Tes.
                Do you still believe that that's so?
18
          That's fine the way I've defined those
19
            I just don't know how you are defining
20
    them.
21
                How do you define themes?
22
          Q.
          Themes is the major gessage that's coming
23
```

How do you define appeals?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

across in the ad.

24

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

can't.

- I don't see much difference between those 1 2 two words.
- How did you use appeals in the context 3 Q. of your statement in the 1977 paper in the Journal 5 of Consumer Research?
- That was written a dozen years ago. 7 I was just stringing along words. That's all.
- How did you use the term claims? 8
- Claims meaning what the claim of the 9 10 advertiser was.
- What did you mean by deceptive 11 Q. 12 practices?
- I don't know. I don't remember what I meant by it then. If the deceptive practice means 15 something to do with the claims or the appeal or the theme of the ad, then we can do it. If it 16 means somehow perception by the consumer, then we 17
 - Do you recall making the statement that the methodology of content analysis allows for reliable, valid and quantitative answers to questions such as what the advertiser's apparent intent was?
 - Notice apparent intent. assumptions or hypotheses of intent.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
12
    Kassarjian - direct
    measure intent of the advertiser.
 1
    not measure that.
 3
                Do you also recall stating that the
    methodology of content analysis allows for
 5
    reliable, valid and quantitative answers with
    regard to the question of who the advertiser's
    apparent audience was?
 8
          We can make assumptions about the apparent
 9
               The critical word is apparent, meaning
    audience.
    assume, hypothesis, not fact.
10
11
                It's an assumption, however, based
12
    upon a research methodology, is it not?
13
    λ.
          Yes.
14
                In the field of consumer behavior, you
15
    make assumptions all the time based upon research
    methodology such as content analysis, do you not?
16
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
17
18
    of the question.
          I presume we sometimes make assumptions.
19
    Sometimes we don't. I don't know what that
20
           It's so broad, I can't deal with it.
21
                Is there any exact way to determine
22
    the apparent intent of a advertiser?
23
          No, outside of putting the advertiser on a
24
    couch and hoping one can somehow measure the
```

| | Rassarjian - direct |
|------------|--|
| | |
| 1 | motivation of the advertiser. What we really mean |
| 2 | is the communicator, the creator of the ad. If by |
| 3 | advertiser, we mean a corporation, how do you put |
| 4 | a corporation on a couch. If by advertiser we |
| 5 | mean a copywriter, we can put him on a couch. |
| 6 | What we need to do to find out his intent is to |
| 7 | find out something about his own motivation. |
| 8 | Q. Did you attempt to conduct a content |
| 9 | analysis with respect to advertising in this case? |
| 10 | A. No, I did not. |
| L 1 | Q. Did you review any advertising with |
| • | |
| 1 2 | regard to this case? |
| 1.3 | A. I saw about a half a dozen or a dozen ads |
| L 4 | that were handed to me. |
| 5 | Q. Did you perform any content analysis |
| . 6 | of those ads? |
| . 7 | A. I did not do a formal content analysis of |
| 8 | any ads. |
| 9 | Q. Did you perform any content analysis? |
| 20 | A. If looking at it is called a content |
| 1 | analysis, I looked at it but that's all. |
| 2 2 | Q. What's the difference between a |
| 23 | content analysis in terms of it being a research |
| | • |
| 4 | methodology and reading an ad? |

7

10

11

12

.13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

didn't distinguish, formal, informal. A formal
content analysis is a research tool, a method to
objectively quantify whatever it is we are looking
for in an ad. It's a quantitative method. It

produces numbers, statistics and so on.

an informal content analysis or reading an ad as you say is someone who goes to the library, looks at a bunch of ads, a reporter goes back and looks at them and then using his own biases and his own view of the world emerges with some could be very perceptive conclusions about how advertising has changed or communication or what was it that Stalin was really, really saying.

But the difference is reliability and validity. The difference is the quantification, the attempt to make it quantifiable, reliable, repeatable, scientific rather than reportorial, whatever a reporter does, or individualistic. Not that I want to take away from a good reporter that can look at data and say something by any means. It's just a different approach.

g. In the field of consumer behavior, would you use as a research tool both a formal and informal content analysis?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201 731-9668 2017036654

Kassarjian - direct

- 1 A. No. We would not accept the informal as
- 2 scientific under our present philosophy of
- 3 science. We are logical positivistic primarily
- 4 and that desands quantitative reliable data behind
- 5 it so the personal interpretation that a reporter
- 6 might be, we generally do not accept as
- 7 scientific. We call that a case study.
- 8 Q. Why would you not use that in trying
- 9 to assess consumer behavior?
- 10 1. There's nothing wrong with it. It's just
- 11 not an accepted scientific practice as of yet.
- 12 The times influence such of what we do. There's a
- 13 time to do research on physics and there's a time
- 14 to study relativity and there's a time to believe
- 15 the earth is flat and there's a time to do
- 16 research the way we do it.
- 17 Q. Is a part of consumer behavior concern
- 18 with an understanding of people's beliefs,
- 19 | consumers' beliefs?
- 20 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 21 of the question.
- 22 A. The study of attitudes and beliefs are part
- 23 of the field of consumer behavior.
- 24 g. Are formal content analysis used in
- 25 | consumer behavior in determining consumer

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
16
    Kassarjian - direct
    attitudes and beliefs?
1
2
          No.
                What tools do you use in the field of
3
    consumer behavior to determine consumers'
    attitudes and beliefs?
          Public opinion polls would be useful, some
    laboratory experimentation is used at times,
7
    questionnaires of one form or another.
8
                You were talking before about how you
9
    would go about determining an advertiser's intent
10
    and you said bring them in the office and put them
11
    on a couch and I guess it's the closest distance
12
    between the feet, the buttocks and the head theory
13
    by putting them on the couch.
14
          You read that, too.
15
                With much interest, sir.
16
    event, we put the individual on the couch and we
17
18
```

Q. With much interest, sir. In any event, we put the individual on the couch and we ask them questions concerning their intent. Can we also do it by looking at internal documents to see what the intent of the advertiser was?

NR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

A. Internal documents?

Q. Sure. In other words --

A. I don't know what that means.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

17

18

19

21

22

25

If the advertiser prepared a

memorandum memorializing what they were intending

to do, would that help you understand the intent 3

of the advertising?

5 I would have to see it because if you are

talking about stuff that might be in files -- are

7 we in the same ballpark?

Yes, sure.

I don't know what these things are and I

wouldn't be able to deal with it. I do know that 10

marketing people and advertising people sometimes 11

come out with pretty off-the-wall ideas that end 12

13 up in memos they send around and so I have no

14 idea. Sometimes they say awfully screwy things to

15 impress the boss or their secretary or somebody

and so I have no idea what you are referring to.

How do you know that that's so, sir?

Pardon?

How do you know that that's so, that

they say those screwy things?

I talk to advertising people all the time.

Have you made studies of their

23 internal documents?

24 No.

Have you ever worked in an advertising

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    firm?
 2
          No, I have not.
 3
                Have you ever seen any internal
    documents of any advertising or public relations
 5
    firm?
          Nothing that I can particularly remember.
 6
 7
    On the other hand, I want to leave a loophole just
    in case I have seen them and don't remember.
    worked for the Federal Trade Commission and at
10
    times we went through mountains of stuff and and
    who knows what the hell I've seen.
11
          Q.
                What work did you do for the Federal
12
    Trade Commission?
13
          I was a consultant to the commissioner's,
14
15
    particularly Mary Gardner Jones but to the other
    commissioners as well and to the Bureau of
16
17
    Advertising, Division of Advertising.
                Did you offer testimony in any matters
18
    on behalf of the Federal Trade Commission?
19
20
          I have but not while working for them full
21
    time.
22
          Q.
                What matters have you offered
    testimony on?
23
          One of these was the Sears batteries, the
24
   Diehard battery. Another one is Sears
25
```

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|----|---|
| 1 | dishwashersThe Teledyne water pik is well known |
| 2 | because some of the firms handle that. That's all |
| 3 | I can remember for the Federal Trade Commission. |
| 4 | Q. Did any of those matters concern |
| 5 | deceptive advertising? |
| 6 | MR. BLEAKLET: Objection to the form |
| 7 | of the question. |
| 8 | A. The claim was that it was deceptive |
| 9 | advertising. |
| 10 | Q. Did you conclude in any of those |
| 11 | matters that there was deceptive advertising? |
| 12 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 13 | of the question. |
| 14 | A. Yes. |
| 15 | MR. EDELL: What's wrong with the form |
| 16 | of the question? |
| 17 | MR. BLEAKLEY: What do you mean by |
| 18 | deceptive advertising? |
| 19 | g. What do you mean by deceptive |
| 20 | advertising, sir? |
| 21 | A. That's a very difficult question to answer. |
| 22 | There's quite a bit of literature attempting to |
| 23 | define what that means. My own working |
| 24 | definition, and I don't want to get into it and |
| 25 | have a big long discussion on who said what, but |

- l my own definition is that advertising material
- 2 | that simply is not true. It's misleading in one
- 3 form or another.
- 4 Q. In which matter or matters did you
- 5 determine that there was deceptive advertising?
- 6 A. I felt that some of the claims made for the,
- 7 | the implications made in the advertising for Sears
- 8 batteries, that is, it would leave an impression
- 9 in the minds of the consumer that it was not true.
- 10 Q. Upon what information did you base
- 11 | that determination?
- 12 A. Knowledge of what the facts were.
- 13 Q. What were the facts in that case that
- 14 you based your opinion on that there was deceptive
- 15 advertising?
- 16 A. You want me to go into detail on this?
- 17 Q. Yes, please.
- 18 A. One of the ads, for example, you may
- 19 resember them, had twelve cars or a bunch of cars
- 20 on a winter scene in the snow all lined up with
- 21 their lights left on and then the lights go out
- 22 and them it's one battery light that lasts the
- 23 longest. In another one it's a winter scene and
- 24 | people try to start their car and only one of them
- 25 starts. We were carefully told that was a Sears

```
21
    Kassarjian - direct
    Diehard.
 2
          What the viewer was not told if I remember
    the case correctly was that it's true that only
 3
    one was a brand new freshly charged Diehard.
    others were two-year old batteries that had not
    been freshly charged. That left an impression in
    my opinion in the mind of the viewer of the ad
    that the Diehard was a superior battery. It may
    or may not have been a superior battery but I use
    those facts to determine that it was leaving an
10
    impression that the Diehard was a superior
11
12
    battery.
                Did you perform any surveys in order
13
14
    to see what impression was left with the consumer
    with regard to those advertisements?
15
          I myself did not.
16
                Did anyone?
17
          I believe Sears had surveys done, yes.
18
                Did you review those surveys?
19
          I most likely did. I don't remember.
20
                Did you consider those surveys to be
21
          Q.
22
    valid or invalid?
                MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
23
```

No survey is perfectly valid. Many surveys

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

the question.

24

25

22 Kassarjian - direct are pretty crappy. I don't remember if I felt they were reasonably done or not but you can pick 3 holes in any study as you well know. I'm well aware of that. 5 I suppose you've done it. Okay. 6 Or I've had it done to me. why did you not think it was necessary to perform a study to see what people who saw these Sears ads thought was being conveyed by the advertisement? MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 10 of the question. 11 Because in my 25, 30 years of experience in 12 this field, because of thousands of studies I've 13 seen and read. I felt that I could make a reasoned 14 15 conclusion on how consumers would perceive and behave towards an ad without having done a study. 16 I didn't think a study was necessary. It's not 17 always necessary. 18 19 How do you know when a study is or is not necessary? 20 21 If somehow I can feel comfortable in stating I know what consumers would do based on many other 23 studies, based on many years of experience. I can go ahead and give a statement on it. 24

So you could look at the Sears Diehard

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
23
    Kassarjian - direct
    battery ads and conclude how those ads would be
 2
    interpreted by consumers.
                               Is that correct?
 3
          I felt that I could make a statement as to
    what I thought the average consumer would perceive
    in that ad, yes.
                By simply looking at the
    advertisement. Is that correct?
7
                That was based upon your 25 years of
9
    experience?
10
          Well, and hundreds if not thousands of
11
    articles and studies I've read.
12
                Would a content analysis of
13
    advertising have helped in performing your task of
14
    deciding whether the advertising was or was not
15
    deceptive?
16
               Deception involves how an ad will be
17
18
    perceived by the average consumer, the intelligent
    consumer, the stupid consumer, whatever segment of
19
    consumer. A content analysis can only tell you
20
    what is in the ad itself. It's not a perception
21
22
    variable.
                Did you review any content analysis in
23
    this case other than that performed by Professor
    Pollay?
25
```

- _____
- 1 A. I saw two Xerox copies of two articles which
- 2 I very quickly skinged a couple of years ago and I
- 3 don't remember if they were a content analysis or
- f not.
- 5 Q. I show you what has been marked Sudman
- 6 2 for identification. Have you ever seen that
- 7 before?
- 8 A. No. I don't know what all this is. I've
- 9 never seen this.
- 10 Q. If you were going to perform a content
- 11 | analysis of articles in the New York Times from
- 12 | 1948 through 1985 with respect to health dangers
- 13 of cigarette smoking, how would you do it?
- 14 MR. FARRISH: Object to the form of
- 15 | the question.
- 16 A. You want me sitting here to design a study
- 17 that might take several days and weeks to figure
- 16 out in order to get it accurately? I think that's
- 19 asking an awful lot of me.
- 20 Q. What would you do to start out?
- 21 MR. SILFEN: Object to the form of the
- 22 question.
- 23 A. My first question would be I would want to
- 24 know what are we doing, why are we doing it, what
- 25 are we looking for, what is it that we want to

Kassarjian - direct

find out. 1

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We are trying to find out the awareness of the public with regard to the health dangers of cigarette smoking during the years 1948 through 1985.

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

Content analysis does not measure awareness of the public of anything. What it will do is it will tell you how many articles may have been written and what the articles may have been about. From there, one must assume that if there have been lots of articles written on the topic and the medium has a lot of readers, that people have seen it, but content analysis in and of itself can only tell you how often an article has been written, how many there were.

So we don't have to spend the day designing the study, if my object was to try to find out what the public's awareness was with regard to health hazards of digarette smoking, you would not be able to design a content analysis to accomplish that. Is that correct?

No, that's not what I said.

Would you be able to conduct an

waga and spinelli cartified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct analysis to agcertain what the awareness was the public with regard to the health dangers of cigarette smoking by looking at newspaper articles? 5 MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of the question. 7 By looking at newspaper articles, what I can tell you is how many articles were published in any given month, year, what the content of that 10 article was and what it was, what it was saying, and I can tell you by looking at other types of 11 figures, circulation figures, how many people were 12 13 exposed to that, so I can tell you how many 14 articles were published, how many people were 15 exposed to it but I cannot tell you what any single individual saw, didn't see, understood or 16 didn't understand. 17 18 Q. How would you go about performing the content analysis of the article itself to see what 19 20 it said? First I would sit down and try to develop a 21 22 series of categories of what it is I'm measuring. For example, if my study is on blacks, I first had 23 to define what a black is, how can you tell one 24

when you see one and develop categories of what

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

6

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

blackness meant, flat nose, protruding sinus, dark
skin, large lips.

3 Q. With regard to health dangers, would 4 we have to define what we meant by health 5 dangers?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ SILFEN: Object to the form of the question.

- A. I don't know what you are looking for in this kind of a study so I would have to know what it is you would want to see and then I'd try to develop categories to see if these were there.
- Q. What I was trying to do is find out what the awareness was of the public with regard to health dangers associated with cigarette smoking.

MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of the question.

- A. Content analysis will only tell you what the themes of the ad is, the content of the ad. It does not measure directly awareness.
- Q. I thought that you said that recognizing that you cannot measure awareness per se, you could still use a content analysis of articles to help you determine what the awareness was of people during a certain time period

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| | K a | . 3 | \$ | 4 | I | 1 | í | • | n | - | đ | ī | Ŧ | • | C | t |
|--|-----|-----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--|-----|-----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

the awareness was.

concerning the health hazards of cigarettes.

incorrect?

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Objection to the form 3 MR. BLEAKLEY: of the question.

- You are switching it on me. You are saying, I'm telling you you can't measure awareness directly and I'm also telling you that you can use that information to make assumptions about what
 - If we want to use the content analysis to make assumptions as to what the awareness was concerning the health dangers of cigarette smoking, how would you go about categorizing information in the articles?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

- I cannot, sitting here under the very specific conditions of a deposition, design a scientific study at the moment. This is something I would have to spend several weeks on, some time on, I don't know, a week, a day, but surely not under the tense conditions of a deposition can' I be that creative. I just gin't that smart.
- Would one of the things that you would Q. want to do is define what was meant by health

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
29
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
    dangers?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 2
    of the question.
 3
          Yes.
                Why was that?
 5
          I have to know what you are looking for.
 6
                It wouldn't be enough to just simply
 7
    say health dangers to put that in a category
    without defining what would fall within that
9
10
    category?
                HR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
11
    of the question.
12
13
          No.
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
14
    interpose my objection, Professor Kassarjian,
15
    before you answer.
                Why is that?
17
          I have to know what we are looking for. I
18
    have to create categories. I have to define
19
    categories very precisely and the word health
    danger is not a particularly precise definition of
21
    anything.
22
                Could you read an index to, for
23
    example, the New York Times for the years 1948
    through 1985, count out the number of articles
```

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|-----|---|
| 1 | that dealt with health dangers of digarette |
| | smoking and draw any conclusions with regard to |
| 2 | _ |
| 3 | the awareness of the public concerning the health |
| 4 | dangers of cigarette smoking? |
| 5 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 6 | of the question. |
| 7 | A. I don't know what the definition of health |
| 8 | danger is used by the guide to periodicals, |
| 9 | whatever you said. If I knew that, then I could |
| 10 | start making some assumptions that based on that |
| 11 | definition, I could then make assumptions about |
| 12 | what it was, yes. |
| 13 | g. But you would have to know what the |
| 14 | definition of health danger was first? |
| 15 | A. In order to make any rational conclusion, I |
| | would have to know what that word means. |
| 16 | |
| 17 | Q. What's cognitive dissonance? |
| 18 | A. It's a theory that was popular about thirty |
| 19 | years ago on how people balanced their values and |
| 20 | attitudes and tried to stay consistent in their |
| 21 | belief systems. |
| 22 | g. It's not a popular theory today? |
| 23 | A. There isn't much research on it. It's |
| 2 6 | floating around. You find it in textbooks. |
| 25 | g. Do you believe that cognitive |

```
31
    Kassarjian - direct
    dissonance has a place in consumer behavior?
 1
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 2
    of the question.
 3
          Yes. It should be a few pages, in any
 4
    textbook on consumer behavior there ought to be
 S
    something about cognitive dissonance. It had its
 7
    place in the history of the field.
                It's your testimony that it doesn't
 8
    have any valid purpose today in the field of
 9
    consumer behavior other than from an historical
10
    perspective. Is that correct?
11
12
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
13
    of the question.
14
          No, it isn't.
15
                Sir?
          Q.
          It is not. That is, I disagree with what
16
    you said.
               I'm not sure how the question was
17
18
    worded.
19
                How can cognitive dissonance be used
          ο.
    today to understand consumer behavior?
20
21
          There are many, sany approaches one can take
    to understand husan behavior. It's such a cosplex
22
    phenomenon. There are many, many theories.
23
    Learning theory is floating around, Freudian
24
    theory is there with egos, libidos and superegos.
25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
    There's a lot of work on conditioned response and
 1
    how one consumer can be conditioned through music
 2
    to like a product.
                        There's a series of
 3
    social-psychological theories. One of these sets
    of theories are called balanced theories.
    several of those. One of those balanced theories
    is Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance so I
    don't want to reject it. It's another way of,
    another approach to understanding human behavior.
    Each of them take a little bit of the field and
    try to feel with it and explain that and that's
11
    its place.
12
                Do you subscribe to the theory of
13
          ٥.
    cognitive dissonance?
14
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                               Objection to the form
15
16
    of the question.
          I'm not sure what subscribe means.
17
                            I wrote an article on it
    great fun at the time.
18
    and became famous. That was enough to subscribe
19
    to it, I suppose, but today I just see it as
```

another point of view that can be used in some

Which paper is it that you wrote on

cases and makes sense in other cases.

cases it doesn't make a lot of sense.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

another interesting idea.

21

22

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9668

It's just

```
33
    Kassarjian - direct
    cognitive dissonance that made you famous?
 2
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
    of the question.
 3
          I didn't quite mean it in that kind of an
    immodest way.
                   I was trying to make fun of
    myself. There's a paper that I'm sure you must
    have called California Management Review about
    1965, '66.
 A
 9
          ٥.
                Did you use cognitive dissonance in
10
    evaluating behavior in that case?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
11
    of the question.
12
13
          That study was an attempt to introduce
    cognitive dissonance which had been known in
14
15
    social psychology for about a decade, no, half a
16
    decade before, to the field of marketing and to
    the field of management saying that there's a
17
    theory out here that under some conditions might
18
    find useful, and to explain that theory, we did a
19
    little study on people's reactions using students,
20
    people's reactions to the surgeon general's
21
22
    report, the 1964 report on the dangers of smoking
    and health I think it was galled. And that
23
```

surgeon general's report was used as a vehicle in

order to introduce cognitive dissonance theory,

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

. 25

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|-----|--|
| 1 | festinger's theory to the management community and |
| 2 | that's what the purpose of it was. |
| 3 | Q. Do you still believe that the |
| 4 | conclusions in that paper are valid today? |
| 5 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 6 | of the question. |
| 7 | A. It's too broad a question. I don't know |
| 8 | what conclusions you mean. |
| 9 | Q. Is there anything that you wrote in |
| 10 | that paper that you disagree with today? |
| 11 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 12 | of the question. |
| 13 | A. I have no idea. There must be 10,000 words |
| 14 | in that article. I have no idea if there were |
| 15 | three or four words in a row that I would disagree |
| 16 | with or not disagree with. |
| 17 | MR. EDILL: With the understanding |
| 18 | that any writings on this are mine, they really |
| 19 | are only lines or highlighting, I would like to |
| 20 | show you this copy. |
| 21 | (Kassarjian Exhibit 1 marked for |
| 22 | identification.) |
| 23 | Q. I show you what has been marked |
| 24 | Kassarjian 1. Is that the paper that we were |
| 2 8 | i Alleing about stwo |

```
Kassarjian - direct
          Yes.
 2
                Could you tell me what, if anything,
    you disagree with in that paper today?
 3
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
    of the question.
          I was just thinking how young and beautiful
 6
    Joel Cohen and I were a quarter century ago.
 7
                                                       Are
    you serious? Do you want me to go through this
 8
    thing and find which word I object to 25 years
 9
    later?
10
11
          Q.
                Please.
          Now?
12
13
          Q.
                Yes.
          In the next ten minutes?
14
15
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Objection.
16
          ٥.
                In the next four or five or six or ten
17
    hours.
18
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
    of the question.
19
          I have no idea which of these phrases I
20
    disagree with today.
21
22
                If you prefer, I'll read every
23
    sentence to you but I think it would be easier for
    everybody that you read it yourself and you tell
24
25
    me what, if anything, you disagree with in that
```

```
36
    Kassarjian - direct
    paper today.
 2
                               Objection to the form
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
 3
    of the question.
          It would be a lot easier if you would point
    out a sentence that you've got in mind and then
    ask me if I agree or disagree with that today.
 7
    Why don't we do it that way because reading any
8
    set of words or any sentence out of context and
    asking me if I agree with that depends entirely on
    what it's to be used for.
10
                That's why I don't want to take
          Q.
11
12
    anything out of context. In the context of your
    paper. I want to know what, if anything, you
13
    disagree with today.
14
          I don't remember.
                              I cannot answer your
15
    question.
              I's unable to answer your question.
16
17
                Why are you unable to answer my
    question as to what, if anything --
18
19
          What are you talking about?
20
                What, if any, conclusions in your
    paper do you disagree with today?
21
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
22
23
    of the question.
          There's a section called conclusions.
24
```

read that, then?

25

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|-----|--|
| | • |
| 1 | Q. You can read the whole paper. |
| 2 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 3 | Q. My question is not limited to the |
| 4 | section entitled conclusions. |
| 5 | A. That's what you asked me, which of the |
| 6 | conclusions do I disagree with so I'm reading the |
| 7 | conclusions. |
| - | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | the paper that there were conclusions contained in |
| 0 | your paper that were not just included in the |
| 1 | "Conclusion" section of the paper. |
| 2 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Is that a question? |
| 3 | MR. EDELL: No. That's a statement |
| 4 | and I'm asking him for his |
| 5 | MR. BLEAKLEY: What question do you |
| 6 | want him to answer? |
| | |
| 7 | MR. EDELL: I thought it was clear, |
| . 8 | Mr. Bleakley. |
| 9 | MR. BLEAKLEY: It's not clear to se. |
| 0 | MR. PARRISH: I object to the form of |
| 1 | the statement in the sense that it forms the basis |
| 2 | for any question that you are asking him. |
| 13 | MR. BLEAKLEY: What do you want Dr. |
| _ | • |
| 2.4 | Kassarjian to do now? |

25

| 38 |
|--|
| Kassarjian - direct |
| Kassarjian to tell me what, if any, conclusions in |
| his paper marked as Kassarjian 1 for |
| identification he presently disagrees with today. |
| MR. BLEAKLEY: He answered that |
| question. He said he can't. He told you if you |
| want him to, he will read the section entitled |
| conclusions and see whether there's anything in |
| there that he disagrees with. Do you want him to |
| do that or not? |
| MR. EDELL: I told him that I would |
| like for him to review the entire paper. If he |
| doesn't want to do that, I'll read the entire |
| paper to him. |
| MR. BLEAKLEY: You do whatever you |
| want. It's your deposition. You have to make |
| sure the witness understands what you want him to |
| do. |
| MR. EDELL: I thought I was being |
| pretty clear on it. |
| MR. BLEAKLEY: The only person in this |
| person to whom it's clear is you. |
| MR. EDELL: I think it will be clear |
| to the jury, Mr. Bleakley |
| MR. BLEAKLEY: Proceed. |
| A. I don't have the vaguest idea what I'm |
| |

supposed to do now.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

- 2 I would like for you, Dr. Kassarjian, to read the paper that you wrote and you say made 3 you famous which we marked as Kassarjian 1 and tell us which, if any, of the conclusions 5 contained in that paper you presently disagree with.
 - MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of the question.
 - I don't know what you are defining as conclusions. If you will tell me what conclusions and which of the statements in this article are conclusions, I will tell you one by one whether I agree with them or not. This paper has something like, I just figured out, 6,000 words in it. I don't know what a conclusion means from your point of view and, therefore, I don't know what a conclusion is.
 - I was trying to limit your review of the paper to some extent. Maybe by trying to facilitate, I've presented problems. Then I would like for you to review Eassarjian Exhibit 1, the paper that you told us made you famous, and tell us what, if any, statements or conclusions and/or conclusions contained in that paper you presently

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    disagree with.
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
 2
                                Objection to the form
    of the question.
 3
          I cannot discuss a conclusion because a
 5
    conclusion is in the eye of the beholder.
    Therefore, I don't know whether what you call a
    conclusion and I call a conclusion is the same
 7
 8
    thing. If we want to talk about a clearly defined
    grammatical entity like a sentence, I will go
    through it sentence by sentence.
10
          Here we go. Sentence one, "A reprint from
11
12
    the California Management Review, copyright 1965
    by The Regents of the University of California," I
13
    don't disagree with that statement.
14
15
           "Harold H. Kassarjian and Joel B. Cohen,"
    authors, I don't disagree with that. Title:
16
17
    "Cognitive Dissonance and Consumer Behavior," very
18
    attractive title. "Reactions to the Surgeon
    General's Report on Smoking and Health." That's
19
20
    what the study, the substantive part of the study
    is about.
21
          "The field of human behavior and its various
22
    subsets, especially consumer behavior, is fully as
23
    coaplex and as confusing as the jargon with which
24
```

we attempt to describe it." I think anyone who has

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    read any of this literature will agree with that
 2
    completely.
                Does that include yourself? I'm not
 3
    concerned with anyone else. I'm concerned with
 5
    you. Do you agree with that statement?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 6
 7
    of the question.
          In my point of view, I don't see the field
 8
    as complex and as confusing but this was written
 9
10
    not to me. This was written for managers who read
    the California Management Review in 1965 and from
11
    their point of view. I felt that the field would
12
    be perceived as complex and confusing. "From
13
14
    among the bewildering array of proposed answers,
    partial evidence and occasionally impartial
15
    evidence, is it possible to assemble some sort of
16
    meaningful, theoretical system."
17
                MR. BLEAKLEY: I assume you don't want
18
    him to say whether he agrees with the question.
19
20
                MR. EDELL: He wanted to read every
21
    sentence.
                MR. BLEAKLEY: He didn't want to read
22
    every sentence, Mr. Edell. You are the one that's
23
    forcing us to go through this absurd exercise.
24
    Dr. Kassarjian did not say, "I want to go through
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
    this article sentence by sentence."
 1
 2
    absolutely clear on the record that if we
    going to sit here for the next three hours and
    have Dr. Kassarjian read this article sentence by
    sentence, it is because you are asking him to do
 5
    it and for no other reason.
                MR. EDELL: I'm not asking him to read
 7
                           Mr. Bleakley, you and the
 8
    aloud every sentence.
    witness are playing games. All I wanted to do was
9
    find out whether or not there's anything in that
10
    paper that he disagrees with presently.
                                              It's very
11
    simple.
12
                               No, it isn't very
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
13
             It's an absurd question.
14
    simple.
15
                MR. EDELL:
                           Let me finish, Bleakley.
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Bleakley?
16
                MR. EDELL: Bleakley, Blakeley,
17
    whatever you call yourself.
18
19
                               Who's playing games?
                            I would like to finish my
                MR. EDELL:
20
    statement before you interrupt me.
21
                MR. BLEAKLEY: What is this Blakely,
22
    Bleakley, whatever you call yourself? That's not
23
    game playing?
```

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9668

MR. EDELL:

MR. BLEAKLEY: Cut it out.

2 MR. EDELL: I would much prefer to cut 3 this out. I asked what I thought to be a very simple question. I heard that question asked by not only myself but other people in many other depositions and it's a very simple question. I thought that the witness would be capable of responding to that question without reading into ٠ the record every single sentence, every single word on that document and tell me whether or not 10 he disagrees or agrees with that presently today. 11 I don't want to know whether he agrees with it. 12 All I want to know is whether he disagrees with 13 14 There's no necessity for him to read aloud 15 into the record every sentence. When he gets to a sentence that he disagrees with, please tell me. 16

- A. You are asking me now to find out if there's any sentences I disagree with. Before it was conclusions. Am I right on that?
- 20 Q. Conclusions and statements and you 21 said that wasn't clear.
- 22 A. The way I understand your question, if I
 23 may, is that what you want me to do is say no, I
 24 don't disagree with this or yes, I disagree with
 25 something and then you want to discuss that

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

17

18

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|----|---|
| 1 | sentence in great detail and see if you can pick |
| 2 | holes in it and I don't know what sentence it is |
| 3 | that you want to pick holes at so I can't give you |
| 4 | the answer. |
| 5 | Q. I'm not trying to pick holes in |
| 6 | anything, sir. |
| 7 | A. You are just sitting there looking cute. |
| 8 | Q. I'm sitting here bewildered that you |
| 9 | can't tell se what you disagree with in a paper |
| 10 | that you wrote. |
| 11 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Is that a question? |
| 12 | MR. EDELL: It was a response to a |
| 13 | statement by the witness, Mr. Bleakley. |
| 14 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Let's cut out the |
| 15 | colloguy and get back to questions and answers. |
| 16 | MR. EDELL: I would prefer to do that |
| 17 | and get an answer from the witness. |
| 18 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Put your question to |
| 19 | the witness. |
| 20 | Q. Dr. Kassarjian, please tell us any |
| 21 | statements or conclusions by you contained in |
| 22 | Kassarjian Exhibit 1, the paper that you said made |
| 23 | you famous on cognitive dissonance, with which you |
| 24 | disagree today. |

25

- 1 the question.
- 2 A. 25 years ago when this article was written,
- 3 I agreed with everything in it. In those 25
- 4 years, there was an enormous explosion of
- 5 information and knowledge in a whole variety of
- 6 fields. I don't know, I've not looked at this
- 7 article in the kind of careful analysis that you
- 8 want since I copy edited this paper in 1965. I
- 9 don't know if there's a sentence or a statement or
- 10 a phrase in this paper somewhere that today
- 11 | because of new information I would agree or not
- 12 agree with.
- If I will ask me which phrase you are
- 14 talking about, then I can answer you whether I
- 15 agree with that phrase today or not. I cannot go
- 16 through 6.000 words and decide and think about all
- 17 6,000 words and all the hundreds of thousands,
- 18 tens of thousands of studies in the field to see
- 19 if that word or phrase makes sense today. That's
- 20 an inordinate task.
- 21 If you would like se to take this
- 22 home, spend several days on it, go through it line
- 23 by line and think about the literature, I shall be
- 24 very pleased to write you a report at my regular
- 25 rates on exactly what may be different today than

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 it was 25 years ago.2 Q. Without performing

Kassarjian - direct

3

5

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. Without performing that thorough analysis over a period of days, you can't tell me what statements or conclusions you disagree with in that paper?

6 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 7 of the question.

Q. Is that correct?

A. I can't remember any particular statement I agree with or any particular statement I disagree with. This paper was written 25 years ago.

Q. I'll ask you to read it and to tell me as you sit here today what statements or conclusions you disagree with.

the question. I want to make it absolutely clear on the record that I object to this entire process. It's absurd. It's a waste of all of our time. Dr. Kassarjian made a proposal which I think is an entirely reisonable one. To suggest that he should sit here in this room with a bunch of lawyers and read an article that he wrote 25 years ago and try to give you a full and complete statement of what he agrees with and what he disagrees with while sitting here in this

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

47 Kassarjian - direct deposition room today is a waste of all of our time and I object to it and I want to make it 3 absolutely clear that when this deposition concludes at the end of this day, you will not pick it up and start again if we wasted six hours 5 6 going through this exercise: 7 Why don't you accept the professor's 8 invitation and have him take the thing home and If you want, you can take his deposition at another time and ask him about that article. 10 What do you want to do? 11 12 MR. EDELL: I'm certainly not entering into any colloguy with you. I have a pending 13 question. The witness is reviewing the paper. 14 15 MR. BLEAKLEY: Let's take a break and we'll let Dr. Kassarjian read the entire paper and 16 we'll come back and see what happens next. 17 MR. EDELL: I have no objection to the 18 19 witness reading the paper. Certainly I would prefer for him not to discuss the paper with 20 counsel. There's a pending question and he do so 21 outside the presence of lawyers in an office where 22 he doesn't have the tension of a deposition so

that he can clearly review the document and

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

formulate his response.

24

1

2

3

7

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

Mr. Edell, you don't MR. BLEAKLEY: need to lecture me about talking with a witness while there's a question pending. I understand what's right and what's wrong. Stop making these silly speeches on the record that nobody except you and we are ever going to have an opportunity I suggested that we let Dr. Kassarjian read the paper off the record while we are not all sitting here staring at him. That's all I'm suggesting. It is my intention to get up and leave the room while he does it and I don't need you lecturing me on what's proper and improper about dealing with a witness.

MR. SILFEN: It's my understanding that when he comes back, you'll repeat the question for him to open-ended identify for you the question which is you disagree with a particular sentence and give you an analysis of that sentence. Is that going to be the question when he returns?

MR. EDELL: There must be different rules for counsel from Arnold & Forter than there is for anybody else.

MR. SILFEN: I want to know because

if --

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
49
    Kassarjian - direct
                MR. EDELL:
                             If there's an objection to
 1
    the form of the question, it's on the record.
 2
    don't need your speeches, Mr. Silfen.
                                            We don't
 3
    need Mr. Bleakley's speeches.
 5
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Don't we need yours?
 6
                MR. - EDELL: I'm not making any
 7
    speeches.
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Is that right?
 8
                MR. EDELL: That's right, Mr.
 9
10
               That is absolutely right.
    Bleakley.
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Let's take a break and
11
    Dr. Kassarjian will read the article and when he
12
13
    comes back, we'll see what happens next.
                 (Short break.)
14
15
          Q.
                We are back, Dr. Kassarjian.
16
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Is there a question
17
    pending?
                MR. EDELL:
                             Yes, there is.
18
19
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Do you have the
    question in mind?
20
                THE WITHESS:
                              I would like it
21
22
    repeated.
23
                MR. EDELL: Madam Court Reporter.
                 (Question read.)
24
25
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    the question
          Shall I go through this column by column,
 3
    page by page?
                What would be convenient for you, sir.
          On page 55, first column, which I didn't
    notice but someone pointed out, my name was
    spelled wrong. I will spell it correctly.
    Unfortunately that is an indication of how good I
    am in proofreading or in reviewing an article how
 9
    often it is that one can miss something where I
10
    did not even notice for 25 years that my name had
11
12
    been spelled wrong. Who knows what other
    conclusions there are in this paper that I'm going
13
              Column two, page 55 --
15
                Who pointed that out to you, sir?
16
          Just a moment ago. Someone in this room.
17
    I'm not sure, someone to my right.
                One of the lawyers for the defendants?
18
          I believe it was Mr. Bleakley.
19
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
20
                              Or Blakeley, whatever
21
    he calls himself.
22
                The same person who said he wouldn't
23
    discuss the paper with you.
24
          That was done in this room, sir.
    reading this paper, I was sitting in a telephone
25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    booth. It was getting rather hot, with the full
 2
    realization that these proceedings are costing
    society about $2,000 an hour and so that's an
    enormous amount of pressure on me to read this as
 5
    quickly as possible.
                I don't want you to read it as guickly
 6
 7
    as possible. I want you to thoroughly read it so
 R
    we have a full appreciation of whatever you
    consider to be statements or conclusions that you
    disagree with in that paper that you wrote
10
    regarding cognitive dissonance and consumer
    behavior which we marked as Kassarjian Exhibit 1.
12
          Page 55, column two, I make the statement,
13
    "Why is that it that an advertiser has greater
14
    difficulty in reaching and convincing people who
15
    are not using his product than people who are
16
    already his customers." I would make two changes
17
    in that. I no longer am sure that an advertiser
18
19
    has greater difficulty in reaching and convincing
    people who are not using his product than those
20
```

down, there is the statement, "This feeling of inconsistency or dissonance is a state of

who are. Secondly, I would take out the sexism in

the product of just saying his and use his or her.

wags and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

21

22

23

24

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    disconfort, disequilibrium or tension that demands
    reduction." I no longer believe that the tension
    reduction is the driving force, that in fact
    dissonance is a theory of motivation.
                                            What this
    is saying is that dissonance is a activating drive
    and I no longer believe that to be true.
7
                What has changed during the period of
    is it twenty years?
8
9
          Thirty years since the theory.
                When was the paper authored? I don't
10
    have it in front of me.
11
          This paper was authored in '64 but this
12
    paper is nothing more than an explication of
13
    Festinger's theory for managers and so the
14
15
    Festinger theory was 1957, I believe, and this
    paper was, Festinger's theory is 1957 and this
16
    paper was published in 1965 which means the study
17
    was done in '64. This study was probably done in
18
19
    April, in the spring of '64. The paper was
    probably written that summer, that is, the summer
20
    of '64.
21
                What caused you to change your belief
22
    in that regard?
23
          I just no longer, with the new evidence
24
    that's in, the fact that the studies that have
```

25

```
53
   Kassarjian - direct
   been conducted on dissonance have been quite
    controversial on this point, I just no longer
2
   believe that dissonance, that tension reduction is
                      I believe dissonance causes
    what drives man.
              The issue is whether we go through life
   merely trying to reduce tension or do we sometimes
   go through life trying to increase tension.
7
   Otherwise, there will be no way to explain why a
    person goes on a roller coaster.
                                       That increases
    tension greatly and one need not do that.
10
    save your dollar and not go on a roller coaster
11
    and yet an awful lot of people do.
12
                are you familiar with the current
13
    literature on cognitive dissonance?
14
          I'm not that familiar with it but I don't
15
    think there's that much on it:
                                     Not in the
16
    consumer behavior literature.
17
                In the psychological literature?
18
          If I've run across it in my routine course
19
    of duties, fine, but I don't make a point of
    keeping up with that literature.
21
                Why is that?
          Q.
22
```

Why?

23

24

25

40\$ Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9566

Yes, why.

I can't keep up with everything.

Q. Go ahead.

A. Page 56, column two is the tension reduction. Page 56 column one, claims by Festinger. There are in these papers a series of bullets, that is, blackened triangles, which in an italicized or a bold type, a darker type, these are claims made by Festinger. These are claims made by the theory. After each of these bullets, that is, each of the Festinger claims, there is a paragraph of normal type that attempts to describe what the Festinger theory means, avoiding the psychological jargon and talking directly to managers using the examples. I would not use the same examples today.

Q. Why is that?

A. For example, on page 56, column two, I say, "Advertising which employs the bandwagon approach may also be successful because it possibly enables the individual to submerge his actions in mass behavior." I think that was a poor example to try to show the elimination of responsibility. What I was trying to say is that one way of reducing dissonance is to eliminate personal responsibility for it and I was trying to come up or Joel and I were trying to come up with examples and I think

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    that was a poor example of that.
                What example would you use today?
          It wasn't by my doing. I was forced to do
 3
    it by economic concerns, by my boss, by authority
    figures or something. I was forced to do
 6
    something. It was not my responsibility.
    don't think the bandwagon approach to advertising
 7
 8
    is an example of denying responsibility.
4
              That's not a conclusion. It's merely an
    example of what Festinger meant and I don't think
10
    it's --
11
                What would you think today is an
12
          Q.
13
    appropriate example?
14
          My boss made me do it.
                Page 57, column one, I don't know what
15
    the heck that was. I have a statement about
16
17
    one-third of the way down, "Advertisers have long
    known that an audience will seek out information
    that is consonant with the views that the
19
    individuals themselves hold."
                                   I don't know if
20
    that's true any more. I don't know if it was true
21
    then. I don't know if I can support that
22
    statement. "Advertisers have long known that an
23
    audience will seek out information that is
24
    consonant with the vicus the individuals
```

```
56
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
    themselves hold."
                        I think that advertisers do
 2
    this but I don't know -- see, what I'm saying is
 3
    that advertisers have long known.
                                        I don't know if
    advertisers have long known and that's what I'm
                  I don't know why I said that.
 5
    reacting to.
 6
    have no way of knowing what advertisers have long
            Maybe Cohen knew what they knew.
 7
                Then somewhere I say something about
 8
 9
    primary audience for advertising.
                                        I couldn't
    write on these sheets and I had trouble keeping
10
    track. Here, later on that same paragraph,
11
    "Undoubtedly, the primary audience for advertising
12
13
    is comprised of the advertiser's present
                 I don't know that for a fact any
14
           I don't know if I knew it for a fact then.
15
    Ferhaps that sentence was written by -- I don't
16
17
    know who wrote it and maybe Joel knew for a fact.
                Page 58, the bottom of page 58, column
18
    one, I have a listing of four hypotheses.
19
    this is written, these hypotheses sound like they
20
    may be conclusions or statements of fact and I
21
    would rewrite this in some way to point out that
22
    these were hypotheses and thought statements of
23
```

Did you do anything to try to

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

fact.

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|------------|--|
| 1 | ascertain whether or not these hypotheses were |
| 2 | correct or incorrect? |
| 3 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 4 | of the question. |
| 5 | A. Yes, we conducted a study. I'm going to get |
| 6 | to that in a moment. That's page 58, column two. |
| 7 | In writing this paper up, I think we have left the |
| 9 | impression that this is a high quality scientific |
| 9 | study. |
| 0 | In fact, as is clear in the paper but |
| . 1 | I'm not sure that it has been perceived that |
| 2 | clearly, this was a classroom project. Its |
| 3 | purpose was to teach students how to draw a |
| 4 | sample, how to design a questionnaire, how to do |
| L 5 | interviewing and the whole marketing research |
| 6 | process. It was a marketing research classroom |
| 17 | project. We say in it the study was done in |
| . 8 | conjunction with a class marketing research |
| 9 | project and I would have emphasized that a little |
| 20 | bit more because it gives the impression of higher |
| 21 | quality. |
| 2 2 | for example, we did not do a random |
| 23 | sample of American people. Students could not do |
| 2 4 | that. What we did was to teach them how one would |
| | |

that, we took a very tiny beach community, Santa Monica, had them draw a sample in Santa Monica as if that was the entire United States and it was done by students. These are not professionals.

And I'm not all that sure of the accuracy of the data any more when you are using students.

Kassarjian - direct

A

I've learned since then that students are not the most reliable of folk on this kind of thing so I think I would have written this with a lot more disclaimers in it. In my old age, I'm not so sure of reality any more and I would have put many more disclaimers in that this is a class project, it is simply an example of what dissonance can do.

so that's that. Santa Monica is not by any means representative of the United States or of the American people. It is a beach community and in fact it's a beach community that's not really representative of anything. For example, it's the only community with rent control and you can imagine what impact that has on housing.

rage 59, column one, last sentence,
"Apparently, a majority of all consumers are too
heavily committed to their smoking behavior to be
influenced by persuasive communication no matter

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    how strongly worded or impressively documented."
 1
          Now 25 years later, I can sit in a corner
 2
    and lick my wounds with that dumb statement.
 3
    Because what has happened in this time is that
    people by the tens of thousands, in fact people by
 5
    the millions, have stopped smoking. All consumers
 6
 7
    are not too heavily committed to their smoking
    behavior to be influenced by persuasive
    communication no matter how strongly worded.
 Ģ
    Communication, the times have changed.
10
    people have stopped smoking and I would not have
11
    made such a strong statement.
12
          Q.
                Do you have an opinion as to whether
13
    or not these communications influence behavior?
14
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
15
    of the question.
16
          There are many, many vectors or influences
17
    that go into human behavior. Communication is a
18
    small part of that but I just simply would not
19
    have made that statement. This paper is not about
20
    whether communication influences behavior.
21
22
    I'm trying to talk about is what statements I
    would not be making today and that is a statement
23
24
    I would not make today.
```

What I'm saying is what is the

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

Kassarjian - direct

for your not making that statement today?

A. I just think it sounds silly. It simply

sounds silly. It sounds as if people are so

heavily committed to smoking that they will not

stop and we know that millions upon millions of

people have stopped smoking so it's, it sounds

ridiculous 25 years later.

regard to the number of people who had stopped smoking in 1963 or '64 when you wrote it?

A. We had something. At the point we wrote it, January 1964, I claimed the surgeon general's report went out and there's a statement in here

that nine percent had quit since January of '64.

You didn't have information with

Q. Nine percent of how many people?

A. Let me read it. "Approximately 9 percent had quit since January 1964" -- remember, this was written about summertime of '64 -- "the date of the release of the surgeon general's report this coincides with reports that digarette smoking in California fell eight to ten percent during the first quarter of 1964. As this paper is being written, a few months later, the trend is reversing. Footnote ten." The footnote says Wall Street Journal, April 9, 1964.

wage and spinelli . certified shorthand reporters

Q.

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

24

| | Kassarjian + direct |
|-----|--|
| 1 | Q. Of what significance is the fact that |
| 2 | the trend was reversing? |
| 3 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 4 | of the question. |
| 5 | A. Nothing. It was just a statement. |
| 6 | Q. It was of no significance? |
| 7 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 8 . | of the question. |
| 9 | A. What significance is it to what? |
| 10 | Q. You put it in your paper. I thought |
| 11 | that it may have had some significance in terms of |
| 1 2 | the study that you performed. |
| 13 | A. You asked me if at that time people had |
| 14 | stopped smoking so I said yes, nine percent had |
| 15 | stopped smoking and read you the paragraph where I |
| 16 | got the data from. The last sentence of the |
| 17 | paragraph said the Wall Street Journal said the |
| 1 0 | trend is being reversed and I just read it along |
| 19 | with everything else. |
| 20 | Q. I understand that. I said what, if |
| 21 | any, significance is the fact that the trend was |
| 2 2 | reversing. |
| 2 3 | MR. BLEAKLEY: _ Object to the form of |
| 2.4 | the question. |

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    you just put it in there, I can understand that.
    I want to know what, if any, significance that
 3
    has.
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 5
    of the question.
          I really don't remember why I put that
    statement in, if I put it in.
 7
                                   I don't remember
    why I put that statement in.
                                  Let me be precise.
    I don't remember why one of us put that sentence
9
              I don't remember. In fact, it's amazing
10
    that I can remember anything from 25 years ago.
11
                Before I forget, sir, when was the
12
    last time that you saw the article that was marked
13
      Kassarjian Exhibit 1 before I asked you to
1 4
    review that article today?
15
          I've probably seen this paper twenty times.
16
    People have asked for copies and I'd reach in my
17
    file, hand it to them.
                            There have been times when
18
    I glanced at it.
                      I remember in 1965 someone on
19
    this case either asked me or I gave him a copy of
20
         I noticed it again yesterday, glanced at it
21
    yesterday when I saw a copy that was all marked up
22
23
    like your copy that one of the other attorneys
         So I've seen it. I have not read it
24
    carefully since I proofread the draft in 1964 and
```

I was probably as sloppy then not catching my own
name spelled wrong as I was today in reading it so
the next time I really read it carefully was in
the phone booth half an hour ago.

- 5 Q. Did you discuss the article with the 6 lawyers in preparation for this deposition?
- 7 A. Yes, we talked about it. They mentioned 8 that you would probably ask questions about it and 9 that's about it.
- 10 Q. Did you discuss the substance of the 11 paper and some of the conclusions and statements 12 in the paper?
- 13 A. Not to any great, not to any significant 14 degree.
- Q. Did you discuss any of the statements or conclusions in the paper with the lawyers in this case in preparation for this deposition?
- 18 A. Here we go as to what a conclusion is. We
 19 had discussed some portions of this paper for a
 20 few minutes yesterday, yes.
- 21 Q. When you say a few minutes, five 22 minutes? Is that what you are saying?
- 23 A. Five, ten minutes. _
 - Q. Would you please continue.
 - A. 59, column two is the next note I have,

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

```
Kassarjian - direct
    where I said right in the middle of the column,
 2
    "However, when advertisers set more modest goals
 3
    and give reasons which tend to reduce dissonance
    in a less threatening direction, their success
    should be far greater." I'm making a prediction
    that if they would be more modest in their claims,
    their success would be far greater. I would not
 7
    make this statement today. This statement had
    nothing to do with advertising. It had nothing to
9
10
    do with advertisers or advice to advertisers.
    was attempting to describe dissonance and presents
11
12
    the study of a little classroom study, and to make
    conclusions on what advertisers should or should
13
14
    not do goes far beyond a claim I would make
15
           That's the brashness of youth.
    today.
```

rage 60, column one, 40 percent of the way down there's a sentence is that says, "The results indicated that there has been very little switching, again supporting the thesis that smoking behavior is a very resistant element, and if the cancer linkage does create any change, generally it is not in the area of behavioral change." What a wonderful example of error. What we have seen in the last 25 years is behavioral change on a massive degree. I have no idea of

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

21

22

23

24

numbers but I-sincerely believe the number of people who have stopped are tens of millions of people and I claim here that if there's going to be changes, it's generally not going to be in the direction of behavioral change. No.

Page 60, starting on this page and throughout other parts of it, I talk about, I use the term believability. I talk about the results of the believability guestion. We had asked the question on do you believe the surgeon general's report and then those people who said yes I said are believers or whatever we called them. did we call them. Whatever. I would not use that word believability or belief today. I would use claimed belief because I don't know what they really believed. All I know is their answer to the question do you believe and there's reason to suspect in this data itself that smokers when they said they believed something really didn't believe it at all so every time the word believability comes up, today I would put in claimed believability. That's all I'm saying.

Q. What has led you to the conclusion that you should have or you would today if you were writing the paper change the use of the terms

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    believability and belief to claimed belief?
 1
 2
          Because this paper is giving the impression
    that smokers do not really believe the surgeon
 3
    general's report. No.
                            That smokers do not really
    believe the health risk is so great.
 5
    them do you believe the linkage is proven and as
    you'll see on Table VI -- is that the right
 7
    table -- Table IV, smokers, non-smokers and light
 8
    smokers believe the health dangers more than
              That is, that's what they claimed and
10
11
    yet when we asked these people not what do you
    believe or we asked them projected questions as
12
13
    sometimes used to get, when you are asking
    threatening questions like how many bottles of
14
15
    whiskey do you drink per week, you can't always,
    ask the question directly because you don't get it
16
    or I remember once in doing a study for toilets
17
    for a Cornell School of Architecture, they wanted
18
19
    to know how big the toilet pipes should be, we
    couldn't ask them how many condons per day do you
20
21
    throw in a toilet bowl. We had to ask it some
22
    other way.
                We did the same thing here.
23
    them not what do you believe but what do you think
24
```

of teenagers who smoke and when we asked them

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
67
    Kassarjian - direct
    these kind of questions, we got different
 1
 2
    response. They said teenagers who smoke, many of
 3
    them are foolish, crasy, silly, but not me, and so
    I today believe, I think, that they really did
 5
    believe these reports even though they said no.
    They said no, they don't believe it in order to
 6
 7
    appear consistent to a strange interviewer.
                How do you know when a respondent
 8
    gives you an answer as to whether or not it is a
 9
    claimed belief or a belief?
10
          We don't know that.
11
12
                What is so peculiar about this study
    that you performed that led you to the conclusion
13
    that it was a claimed belief versus a belief?
14
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
15
    of the question.
16
          I just said that I would use that word.
17
    not making any statements as to whether it was
18
    claimed or not. I told you I would change it.
19
    would change it because I think there's enough.
20
    evidence in the data itself that what they said is
21
    not really what they believed. I don't know what
    they believed. I have no way of X-raying them to
23
```

get at that. I only have two or three ways of

questioning them. When I question them in these

waga and spinelli . certified shorthand reporters

24

```
Kassarjian - direct
    two ways and get different results, I've got to
 1
 2
    think that there's something fishy and that's all
    I'm saying. That was my believability.
 3
          Page 60, column two, the last sentence says,
 5
    "If the comparison is not unreasonable for many
    smokers, the smoking behavior was the most
    resistant element while cognitions about health
    were modified more easily." The facts have proven
    me wrong. I don't know about the cognitions about
    health being modified more easily but surely
    smoking behavior was not as resistant an element
11
    as I thought it was because the evidence shows
12
    people have stopped. People have made the
13
    decision, have looked at the information and by
    the millions have made the decision to not smoke.
    Others have made the decision to take the chance,
17
    I quess.
                How do you know that people have
18
    looked at the information, sir?
19
          all I know for a fact is that millions of
20
    people have stopped.
21
                How do you know what the cause of
22
23
    their stopping smoking was?
          As a consumer behavior person, I have based
24
    on many years of experience on what makes
```

69 Kassarjian - direct consumers behave as they do in the marketplace, I can draw on that information, generalize in that information and draw hypotheses or conclusions about why they stopped smoking. I want your conclusions as to why they stopped smoking. I think for the very same reasons they started smoking. What are they, sir? Primarily it's the times, the era, the pressures on the individuals from a variety of sources. This is what the Germans would call What it means is that the times, the pressures on the individual. What causes people to smoke are group pressures, pressures from other people, primarily the social type of pressures. What causes people to stop smoking are primarily group pressures, pressures from other people. If any of you people in this room smoke, you know how much guff you aust put up with to smoke a cigarette. If you don't smoke, you know how much guff you've dished

out to other people who smoke around you and it's

that kind of pressure that is terribly important.

That's a very important vector in starting to

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

2

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    smoking and in stopping to smoke.
                                       I think some of
    the communication materials, I think advertising
    that points out the health dangers and so on are
    another very small vector that goes into people
    stopping smoking. I think the cultural times, the
    climate, the variety of vectors that impinge on an
    individual are what is causing people to stop
    sacking.
                What causes changes in the cultural
 9
          Ω.
    norms of a given time?
10
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
11
12
    of the question.
          Norms, cultures change.
                                   They change.
13
    one causes it. Styles change.
                                    It isn't that
    there is some masty designer out there that's
15
    going to decide all women should now shorten their
16
    skirt six inches. If so, that man would be truly
17
18
    a millionnaire but styles change and designer
    clothes may have a very small impact but they
19
    bought it. All you have to do is look at the
20
    fashion magazines in about April and what we are
21
    supposed to be wearing the next winter to see how
22
    often they have blown it so designers don't make
23
    fashion. Designers don't make fads. Product
24
    manufacturers and advertisers don't cause change.
```

1 2

3

7

10

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The designers, the advertisers, the newspapers, the motion pictures all reflect the change. They add a little bit to it but mostly they reflect it and so what we are dealing with here is that we don't know what causes anything to happen. It just happens. And a fashion designer goes along with it.

- Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether or not cigarette advertising contributed to the social acceptability of smoking?
- 11 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 12 of the question.
- 13 Q. At any point in time.

much too far out on a limb.

- A. I think it reflected that smoking became more acceptable for women in the twenties, say...

 It was reflecting that. I think giving advertising credit for causing it is going much,
 - Q. If I used the word caused, I misspoke. My question is do you have an opinion as to whether or not cigarette advertising contributed to the social acceptability of cigarette smoking.
- A. It didn't hurt it. If it contributed anything, it's very, very little. Times were

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
72
    Kassarjian - direct
    changing. The movies were changing. People were
    smoking in the movies. When Talullah Bankhead
 2
    smokes a cigarette, I don't know if that causes
    times to change but it reflected it. When a
    cigarette billboard says, "Blow some my way," with
    a sexy woman looks at a very handsome man who is
    smoking, I don't want to claim that caused
    change. I'm saying it's reflecting the change and
    it may have had a teeny little vector that may be
    there but surely it's not a significant factor but
10
    it is significant in that it reflects it.
11
                Did communications with respect to
12
    cigarette smoking and health contribute to the
13
    change in the social acceptability of digarette
14
    smoking?
15
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
16
    of the question.
17
          Isn't that the answer I just gave?
10
    thought I said that advertising reflects the
19
    changes that are occurring rather than causes it.
20
                I didn't ask the question with regard
          Q.
21
22
    to advertising.
                MR. EDELL: Could you read back the
23
    question.
               I could be wrong.
24
          If you mean communications in general like
25
```

```
73
    Kassarjian - direct
    motion pictures and novels?
1
                MR. EDELL: Can you read back the
2
3
    question, please.
                (Question read.)
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
5
 6
    the question.
                THE WITNESS: Could you read that
7
    again, please.
8
                (Question read.)
9
          The word communication is so broad, I imply
10
    that you meant advertising. Communication
11
    involves the mass media, motion pictures, novels,
12
    newspapers, magazines, television, radio.
13
    Communications involves face-to-face
14
    communication, conversations, discussions,
15
    lectures and so on. Certainly face-to-face
16
    communication between individuals might have had
17
    some impact on it. Mass communication might have
18
    had some minimal impact but if we mean mass
19
    communication, then I just strongly deeply believe
20
    that communications reflect the times but do not
21
    create the times. The cultural millieu is not
22
    created by a novel or a newspaper or a television
23
         Cultural million is there and then the mass
24
    communications reflects that.
25
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| Kassarjian - direc | : 1 |
|--------------------|-----|
|--------------------|-----|

Q. Articles concerning the health hazards

4 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

5 of the question.

6

7

10

1.1

12

13

15

16

17

19 20

22

23

24

25

- A. Articles on the health hazards of cigarettes are reflecting the fact that editors feel the readers are interested in such articles, if that's what you mean. If you mean planted articles or paid advertisements, that's a different story but if you mean there happens to be an article about smoking and health in Good Housekeeping, that's because an editor decided that would be an interesting article to print and, in that forum, reflects the times.
- Q. You don't have an opinion as to whether or not that type of communication would have an effect on the social acceptability of cigarette smoking?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

21 of the question.

A. It has an effect. It has a small effect just like a bus driver saying throw out that smelly cigar or a beautiful person for me, I used to smoke cigars and when a very attractive person

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct 1 said yuk, you smell awful, surely that had an That has an effect. Articles have an 2 effect. 3 The fact that I can't smoke inside, at that time, had an effect. The fact that not one 5 person in this room is smoking, that has an enormous effect. If any of you want a cigarette, 7 you are not going to light up. All of these pressures, all of these vectors impinge on the individual. 9

Q. How do you determine which one of these elements that you say are part of this vector contributes to the social acceptability of cigarette smoking?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

A. I'm saying it's the times that determine the social acceptability or not acceptability of the product. It's the seitgeist. It's the era. That is the important variable. How do I determine what the influences in the times are, there are a number of studies that would show the relative influence of personality, the relative influence of physiology, the relative influence of groups and cultures and so on. But what you are looking for is what's causing these changes to occur in

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

```
Kassarjian - direct
    behavior and I'm saying the dause of that change
 1
 2
    is the times, the zeitgeist.
 3
                 What causes these changes in the
 4
    eras? What causes the zeitgeist?
 5
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 6
    of the question.
 7
          Wouldn't it be wonderful if we knew that
    next year men are going to start wearing wide ties
    and we could start producing them now.
10
    change. Interests change and attitudes change.
    They change. If we only knew what next year's fad
11
12
    was going to be. If we only knew whether
13
    hula-hoops were going to come in, we could put in
14
    a couple them now.
                        We could make millions.
15
    do change. Everything affects the change.
16
    people talking to people, it's mass communications
17
    it's articles, it's movies, it's books, it's
18
    everything in the society has an impact and is
19
    effected by that impact.
20
                I apologize if some of my questions
    are maive.
21
22
          That's okay.
                What changes people's beliefs?
23
24
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Objection to the form
25
    of the question.
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
77
    Kassarjian - direct
          Beliefs about what?
 1
 2
                I'll make it easy, at least from my
 3
    perspective. The dangers of cigarette smoking.
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
 5
    the question.
          Q.
                Does zeitgeist play a role in this, in
    the change in their beliefs with respect to the
 7
    hazards of cigarette smoking?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 9
10
    of the question.
11
          There are many, I'm calling them vectors.
    think you used the word element.
12
                                      That's fine.
    There are many agents, vectors, that go into
13
    belief change about I think you said health
14
    dangers of cigarette smoking. Surely articles,
15
    surely governmental statements, surely finding
    out, knowing someone who died of lung cancer or
17
    coronary heart disease or prostate cancer, who
18
    knows what other cancers the stuff causes, that
    helps. Surely the advertising for eigerettes that
20
    constantly remind you how dreadful these products
21
    are. That helps. Surely the warning that says if
22
    you are going to smoke this product, it's going to
    kill you dead, that helps. Surely the pressure,
   social pressures that prevent smoking, that cause
25
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct people not to smoke and yet none of us want to admit that we are being pushed around by others so we say to ourselves, it was an ugly coffin nail, I's going to stop, that helps. All of it helps. All of it is the times and the times are all of It's one, it's the reitgeist. 7 You mentioned all of those Q. consunications which conveyed to people the fact that cigarette smoking may be harmful. What about communications which conveyed the opposite, that 10 cigarette smoking hadn't been proven to be 11 harmful? Does that have an effect on beliefs? 12 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 13 1 4 of the question. Those kind of ads are --15 I'm not talking about ads. Any kind 16 of communications, whether it be a press release 17 or an advertorial, is that what the term is, or brand advertising, industry advertising, any form 19

the question.

a. You have to remember that an interpreter in seeing a communication form quite naturally takes that communications material and assumes its

Object to the form of

MR. BLEAKLEY:

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

of communication.

20

21

22

23

24

```
79
    Kassarjian - direct
 2
                It depends upon the reliability of the
 3
    source?
               MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 5
    of the question.
          It assumes the source so that, if I can give
    you an example, if you are going down a street and
    you see a big billboard that says drink milk,
    there's a natural kind of thing, that the milk
    trade association, who is telling me to drink
10
    milk. We immediately want to imbue a source.
11
    With that source, along with that source is a
12
    feeling of validity of the source, so if we know
    this is an ad or if we know this is a press
16
    release or if we know this is a research study or
15
    an article that's written by the tobacco industry,
16
    the average consumer them will automatically
17
18
    question the veracity of it. By doing that, it's
    pointing out that the product is potentially
19
20
    dangerous:
          Let me give you an example. Not long ago
21
    McDonald hamburger chain had a very difficult
22
    problem so they started advertising that said
23
    McDonald hamburgers are made of pure beef and not
24
```

I don't know if you remember that incident

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

but McDonald's sales had dropped 60 per cent in

the midwest as the runor spread that the hamburger

was made out of worms instead of beef. So they

kept saying we pay for beef 69 cents a pound.

Worms cost \$6.49 a pound. Why would we use worms

is what their consercial said.

 What was the effect of that ad? Sales plummetted because people said why are they telling us they are not using worms, they must be using worms. And that ad was a disaster and in fact it's a heavily studied ad because it was such a disastrous decision.

You'll get the same kind of thing when a cigarette company comes out and says there's no evidence that prove it's bad or Carlton is less irritating or whatever it is, has less tar. Every ad that says Carlton has less tar can be interpreted to mean we all have tar and that ain't good for you, Carlton is a little better, switch to us.

Q. Have you seen any surveys to ascertain what consumers' impressions were with respect to certain brands of cigarettes?

 $\label{eq:mr. Bleakley: Objection to the form of the question.}$

waga and spinelli . certified shorthand reporters

| Kassarj | ian - | direct |
|---------|-------|--------|
|---------|-------|--------|

- 1 A. I've seen no survey evidence at all. You
 2 mean relative to this case? I read the Gallup
 3 reports in the papers every once in a while.
 - Q. Did you see any marketing research performed by any of the cigarette manufacturers to see what impressions their ads left with consumers of their products?
 - MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.
- 10 A. No, I have not.
- 11 Q. Have you conducted any studies of your
- 12 own to ascertain what impressions cigarette
- 13 advertising would make upon consumers?
- 14 A. Outside of a classroom project in 1964, I
- 15 have not.

5

7

8

- 16 Q. Have there been successful advertising
- 17 and public relations efforts to change people's
- 18 perceptions with respect to a product?
- 19 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 20 of the question.
- 21 A. Have there been successful campaigns to
- 22 change people' attitudes toward an image of a
- 23 product or an image of a company?
- 24 Q. You gave us examples of what I guess
- 25 | would be considered in the marketing field a very

waga and spinelli . . certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    poor advertising and public relations campaign by
 2
    McDonald's.
 3
          Let's call it stupid.
                Have there ever been any intelligent
 5
    marketing and promotional plans which were
    effective in communicating to the public the
 7
    correct perspective of the market's product?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 9
    of the question.
10
          I can't respond to correct perspective.
    can give you examples of image changes.
11
                Maybe that would be helpful.
12
          A very famous one is DuPont. Between World
13
    War I and World War II, Dufont Corporation, people
14
    felt that wars are caused by warmongers and
15
    industrialists that make a profit. That was
    before World War I, between World War I and World
17
    War II. The munitions manufacturers are the ones
18
    that got us into war.
19
                           That was Dufont.
    the munitions and the gun powder monopoly,
20
    Dufont. Dufont had an image of warmonger,
21
    munitions-maker, bad.
22
                After World Wag II, they set out to
23
    change their image from munitions manufacturer and
24
```

warmongering to better things for better living

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

through chemistry. They did a wonderful job so today when I mention munitions manufacturer, few people would think of DuPont.

- Q. How did they do that?
- A. In 1973, when we were worried about napalm and the students strike, they struck against Dow Chemical, which was a producer of napalm but Dupont also produced napalm and they didn't strike out against Dupont so there's an example of an image change.
- Q. How did DuPont do that?
- it. Maybe we were tired of believing. The times had changed. We no longer believed that wars are caused by the Dufonts and the Rockefellers and the terrible robber barons. That may have been part of it. Undoubtedly I remember their phrase so advertising might have had some part but I don't believe an ad that says better things for better living is what changes attitudes towards Dufont. They changed. I don't know what they did.
- Q. Do you know what other promotional or public relations activities they participated in?
 A. No, I do not.
 - Q. Do public relations activities

wage and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    contribute to the consumers' perception of a
    product?
 2
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 3
    of the question.
          It might have a small effect. . It might just
    have. Teaching might have a small effect. Wait a
    minute, to perceptions of the product did you
    say?
          Q.
          It has an effect, surely. It might have an
    effect. There's some terrible mistakes that have
11
    been made, too, by public relations firms.
12
                There are good public relations
13
    programs and there are bad public relations
14
    programs. There are some that work and some that
15
    don't. Is that right?
.16
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
17
    of the question.
18
                MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
19
20
    the question.
          I don't know if there are good ones or bad
21
    ones. I don't know anything about public
22
    relations.
23
               Do you know anything about the effects
24
    of public relations?
```

waga and spinelli certifled shorthand reporters

3

1 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 2 of the question.

- A. I'm not an expert on public relations or the effects or the implied intent of public relations people. It's not my field.
- Q. You told us that the source of the information would affect the consumers' processing of that information in terms of formulating their beliefs. Is that correct?
- 10 A. I said when consumers perceive information, 11 they attach to that perception the source of who 12 said so, who is telling me.
- 13 Q. Do you know what the relative
 14 reliability of different figures in the area of
 15 cigarette smoking and health were during the
 16 fifties?
- 17 A. I don't know what relative reliability
 18 means.
- 20 conducted studies to see what reliability people
 21 place in different sources during different
 22 periods of time?
- NR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 24 of the question.
- 25 A. I may be missing something. To me

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct reliability means how consistently an individual 1 2 says something or how consistently a judge gives a 3 response to an answer. Maybe it was my inartful use of the Q. 5 term reliability. Maybe I meant to use credibility as opposed to reliability. 7 Oh, excuse me. 8 No, excuse me. Are you aware of studies over the years in which there was an 10 attempt to ascertain what the public's perception was concerning different groups of people in terms 11 of their credibility on the issue of cigarette 12 smoking and health? 13 Credibility that they assume, how much they 14 believe the smoke and health claims, I guess, the 15 16 answer is simple, I have not seen any studies on 17 that topic. Independent of whatever you asked, I 18 have still not seen any studies of it. If a consumer read an article in which 19 20 an apparently independent physician stated that 21

g. If a consumer read an article in which an apparently independent physician stated that the relationship between digarette smoking and disease had not been proven, do you have an opinion as to how that information would be processed concerning the beliefs of that individual concerning digarette smoking and

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

22

health? 1

2 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

3 of the question.

MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of

5 the question.

I have no way of knowing. I need to know

the information. That's not enough. Surely I 7

need to know the year. Surely I need to see the

message. Suraly I need to see in what form it was

presented in and so on. 10

Q. Did you review any messages concerning 11

cigarette smoking and health for any years?

I mentioned I saw some half a dozen ads 13

through several years. If that's a message 14

concerning smoking and health, yes. 15

Did you review any news articles?

17

16

Did you review any press releases? 18

19 You mean for these hearings because over the

last 25, 30 years of living, I do read the

newspaper. In reading the newspaper, I do see 21

ads, I do see articles and so on. You don't mean 22

the normal lay exposure to the mass media but you 23

mean for these hearings did I review any articles

or press releases about smoking. Am I right?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 As an expert in consumer behavior in 2 terms of formulating your opinions in this case, did you review or consider press releases with regard to cigarette smoking and health? 5 I did not. I was not given nor did I see any press releases about smoking and health. 7 Did you see any marketing or public relations plans by cigarette manufacturers or their trade association concerning cigarette 10 smoking and health? I did not. 11 Did you ask to see any of that 12 13 information? I did not. 14 You didn't think it was necessary to 15 review that information in formulating your 16 opinions in this matter? 17 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 18 19 of the question. I'm really not terribly interested in what 20 some marketing strategist thought or said. 21 expertise and interest is in the field of consuser 22 23 behavior and not what marketing strategists

How does in expert in the field of

waga and spinelli curtified shorthand reporters

believe or write.

Q.

24 25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    consumer behavior measure knowledge on the part of
 1
    a consumer concerning the health hazards
 2
    associated with the use of that consumer's use of
 3
    the product?
 5
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Objection to the form
 6
    of the question.
 7
          You are asking me how do we measure
    knowledge or awareness or whatever that a consumer
          Is that it?
                Knowledge, sir, not awareness.
10
11
          How do we measure knowledge a consumer has.
12
    We can develop little tests, multiple choice tests
13
    or open-ended type tests that you see in
14
    classrooms. We can do surveys. We can take
15
    samples of people and experiments and see in
16
    laboratory experiments and hope to hell that we
17
    can generalize from a few people in an experiment
    to people in general. We can do many tests on
18
19
    measuring what knowledge the consumer has.
20
    are many thois, many instruments that can be used.
21
          Q.
                Have you ever devised a test to
    ascertain what knowledge consumers had concerning
    any health hazards associated with the use of
23
24
    cicarettes?
```

Other than the classroom project in 1964.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    no.
 2
                Sir, what do you attribute the
    differences in response to questions concerning
 3
    the beliefs of cigarette smokers versus-
    non-cigarette smokers to questions posed in your
    paper regarding the relationship between cigarette
 7
    smoking and lung cancer?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
    of the question.
          I didn't understand what you said.
10
11
    SOFFY.
                I'll try to make it make sense.
12
                                                  Are
    there differences in the responses between
13
14
    cigarette smokers and non-smokers concerning their
    beliefs with respect to the relationship between
15
    cigarette smoking and lung cancer as reflected in
16
    your paper?
17
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
18
19
    of the question.
               We did get some differences on what
20
    smokers, cigarette smokers and non-smokers said
21
    about illness and health.
22
23
          Q.
                What did you attribute those
    differences to, sir?
24
          At that time we attributed it to -- it's
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
91
    Kassarjian - direct
    backwards. What I wanted to say was at that time
    we attributed it to cognitive dissonance but in
    fact that's backwards. If memory serves me
    correctly, we did the study as a classroom project
    so we could write an article on cognitive
    dissonance and wrote the article on cognitive
   dissonance and used the study as an example so
    cause and effect gets all confused. The study was
    done. Now, we said why are there are differences,
    maybe that's dissonance, let's write an article on
10
    dissonance. Let's become famous.
11
12
                Today you don't believe that the
   differences in the responses to the question as to
13
   whether cigarette smoking is a cause of lung
14
15
   cancer is not due to cognitive dissonance. Is
   that right, sir?
16
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
17
18
   of the question.
          I don't believe that if there are
19
20
   differences today that they are anything like the
   differences we had. I think the differences, if
21
    there are some today, are very minor.
22
                I'm talking about the differences in
23
   your paper, sir.
24
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Grange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9668

Object to the form of

MR. BLEAKLEY:

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    the question. -
 2
          Q.
                Is it your opinion, sir, that the
    differences in the responses that you got in your
 3
    paper in 1964 were attributable to cognitive
    dissonance?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 7
    of the question.
          I don't know what it's attributable to.
    Cognitive dissonance is one possible hypothesis
10
    that we were able to use at the time and used it.
    I don't know if I really believed it was all
11
    cognitive dissonance then. I don't know if I
12
    believe it today. It's one possible solution.
13
                In the conclusion of the paper I say
14
    just that or I hope I say just that. "Festinger's
15
    theory is definitely not a panacea to all business
16
    problems. Certainly it does not explain all
17
    behavior; it does not allow for unequivocal
18
    predictions nor has it been offered by social
19
    scientists as a complete answer. However, it may
    provide the businessman and the researcher with a
21
    broader frame of reference for understanding human
22
    behavior."
23
                That was the purpose of this article,
24
25 to present cognitive dissonance to the field of
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    management and say look, here is another way of
    looking at things, and this is what cognitive
    dissonance is and here is a study that we've got
    as an example of what it means.
                Assuming that cognitive dissonance
    resulted in the differences in the responses
    between smokers and non-smokers, can you tell us
    whether or not cognitive dissonance works on a
    conscious level?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
10
    of the question.
11
          That's a very complex question as to whether
12
    this tension creation is conscious or
13
                  It involves very complex theorizing
14
    as what even consciousness means and if anyone
15
    could help me in wiggling out of answering that
16
    question, I would like to because I don't know how
17
    to deal with it. I simply don't know how to
18
    answer whether something is at a conscious or
19
20
    unconscious level.
```

Do your best, sir. I don't want you to wiggle out of anything. I would like an answer to the question.

MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of the question.

waga and spinelli cortified shorthand reporters

21

22

24 25

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|----|--|
| 1 | A. If you wear by consciousness the types of |
| 2 | things that Sigmund Freud talked about, the deeper |
| 3 | layer of unconscious feelings and sexual drives |
| 4 | and libido and so on, then this is not at an |
| 5 | unconscious level. |
| 6 | Q. How do you define consciousness, a |
| 7 | conscious level versus an unconscious level, in |
| 8 | terms of your use of those terms in consumer |
| 9 | behavior? |
| 10 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 11 | of the question. |
| 12 | A. Until right now, I'm embarrassed to say I |
| 13 | really gave it damn little if any thought. I just |
| 14 | am not interested in that area of theorizing about |
| 15 | what is conscious and what is not conscious. |
| 16 | g. Does it make a difference in |
| 17 | understanding consumer behavior as to whether or |
| 18 | not cognitive dissonance works on a conscious or |
| 19 | unconscious level? |
| 20 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 21 | of the question. |
| 22 | A. I don't know. I've never thought about it. |

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

conscious and unconscious level?

2

23

3

5

10

11

20

21

22

it.

1 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 2 of the question.

- I've just never thought about consciousness as a critical variable in consumer behavior and somehow you are implying that there are two kinds of behavior, conscious and unconscious. likely it's a continuum and we have to draw the line somewhere and I've just never thought about
- You don't know where you would draw Չ. that line on that continuum?
- MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 12 of the question. 13
- 14 Between conscious and unconscious. 15 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of 16 the question.
- 17 I don't even know what the words mean. sorry. In my world, they don't mean a damn 19 thing. I don't use them.
 - Sir, does a person's use of a product affect the individual's beliefs with respect to risks associated with the use of the product? MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 23
- 24 of the question.
- 25 I didn't understand it.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Q. If I use a product and I've used a product for a number of years and there has not been any apparent injury to me from my use of the product and all of a sudden I'm told that there are risks regarding the use of the product, will my prior use of that product affect my formulation of beliefs with respect to the truthfulness of the communication which I have received?

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$ BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

- A. What you are saying is that if you are a cigarette smoker, would you therefore believe that the risks are more or less if you were not a smoker?
- Q. I really wasn't talking about cigarette smoking specifically, sir. I'm talking about products in general.
- A. If you are a user of a product, then if you are told that product is risky, that there's a risk associated with it, that such I follow. Now what's the question? You are a user of the product and you are told the product has risk associated with it. Therefore what?
- Q. I'm the user of a product for some number of years, let's say ten years, and I use

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

this product every day and nothing adverse happens
to me. I'm told after ten years of use that there
may be some hazards regarding the use of the
product. Will my prior use of the product and my
experience with the product affect my perception
of the communication regarding the possibility of
the hazards?

Kassarjian - direct

of the question.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

A. If you are a long-time user of Tylenol and then you are told there's a slight risk that Tylenol has been tampered with, will it affect your purchase of Tylenol? Hell yes. If you are a user of Campbell's soup, cream of mushroom, and you're told that cream of mushroom has botulism it in, will it affect your belief even though you

used it for 100 years? Hell yes.

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

Q. With those two examples, you are assuming that there has been some change that has affected the product that I've used all these years. I certainly didn't use the Campbell's soup with botulism over the ten-year period. Otherwise I would have gotten it. I didn't use tampered-with Tylenol. Otherwise I would have had some adverse effect.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

I'm assuming for the purpose of this

question that there is no change in the product

itself, that the product and my use of the product

remains the same and that there hasn't been any

tampering or contamination such as you used in

your examples.

- A. You are a heavy user of aspirin and you are told that aspirin causes stonach bleeding in some people, does that affect your change in the use of aspirin?
- Q. Not change in the use of aspirin, my information processing of that warning that aspirin may cause bleeding, stomach bleeding in some people.

 $$\tt MR.\ BLEAKLEY:\ Object\ to\ the\ form\ of\ the\ question,$

- A. Will it cause a change in your information processing, I don't understand the question.
- Q. We'll use your example. I've been using aspirin for ten years, been taking aspirin every four hours, taking two aspirin every four hours for ten years and then I am advised by reading a newspaper article that there had been studies that show that the use of aspirin has resulted in stomach ulcers or stomach bleeding in

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    some users. Will my past experience and use of
    aspirin over that ten-year period without any
 2
    adverse results affect in any way my belief with
    respect to the information concerning any
    potential hazards?
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                               Objection to the form
    of the question.
 7
          Will it affect your perception of hazards?
    I don't think so. In fact, if I understood the
9
                                            This is no
    question correctly, I don't think so.
10
    different than the Tylenol example except that
    it's lower. You have been using it and every time
12
    I use aspirin now, a few hours later if I get a
13
    slight stomach pang, I wonder if my stomach is
               Half the time it's because it's morning
15
    and I'm hungry but I never know and that's in my
16
              I'll never know.
                                I don't know how to
    thought.
17
               I keep looking in my belly button and
18
    it looks normal, so I don't know if that's
19
                              I'm having a lot of
    answering your question.
20
    trouble grabbing it. What is it you want me to
21
    say?
22
                I don't want you to say anything
          ٥.
23
    just trying to find out some information.
24
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

all I'm trying to do.

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9866

In the field of consumer

Kassarjian - direct
behavior, does the temporal relationship between
the potential risk and the use of the product
affect the consumer's belief with respect to any
potential hazard?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

A. I'm beginning to understand what you are saying. You have a model of a consumer as do a number of experimental psychologists. Some people in consumer behavior, as a great big computer that takes in information and puts surveillances on them, good, bad, and then takes in more information and then somehow by using complex or very simple mathematical models, adds these up and makes a comparison, these are the good things and these are the bad things and so on.

I don't think consumers behave in that kind of a rational computer-like fashion for most products, for the overwhelming number of products. I don't know if cigarettes is or is not there but in the overwhelming number of products, people do things. Then if you push them on why they did it, they give you rationalizations and they give you answers as to why they did it, the kind of thing we got here. They just do them.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

They make the-decision. I simply personally do not believe that the human being is one great big computer data processing machine and that this is the way we do things and this is the way we make decisions. I really don't believe that when you walk down a hall and you see what I see, a very attractive young lady, I sit there and quickly calculate waist size and ankle size and eyeball color and relationship of nose to lips and then decide she is beautiful. I look and I say you are beautiful and then if you were to ask me why did you say that, well then I might say the eyeballs are blue and the nose is round.

I think we make the decision, we do it and then we add rationalization when we are asked for the great majority of products. That may not be so in a businessman buying a main frame computer. But for the great majority of decisions by a consumer, it's made and we don't behave like a computer. I also appreciate that there are a number of my colleagues who disagree with that, with my view, so I think I'm right and they think they are right.

Q. Is what you are saying that most consumer behavior is not, let's see if I can use

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    the right phrase, a completely informed decision
 1
 2
    with regard to the use of a product?
 3
                MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
    the question.
 5
          I would like to go one step further and say
    probably all behavior is not completely informed.
 7
    How can we be completely informed about
    everything, about anything, so on a very
 a
 9
    philosophical level, we are not completely
10
    informed.
               When I buy a shirt that says 65 percent
    orion and 35 percent cotton, I'm not completely
11
    informed. I suspect it's not really 65 percent.
12
    Maybe it's 64.9 percent.
                              Maybe it's 72 percent.
13
    I'm not completely informed but I make decisions
14
    on what information I have and so the complete
15
    information I think is just a philosophical
16
17
    question, whether we can ever be completely
    informed about anything.
18
19
                Do you think that most consumer
20
    decisions with respect to the use of products are
    informed decisions?
21
22
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
23
    of the question.
24
          We have a lot of information about a lot of
    products.
               If some of that information is
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| | kassarjian - direct |
|----|--|
| 1 | utilized, then it's an informed decision. If none |
| 2 | of it is utilized, it's a non-informed decision. |
| 3 | Q. How does an expert in consumer |
| 4 | behavior ascertain what information a consumer |
| 5 | uses in making a decision? |
| 6 | A. That is very, very difficult because we |
| 7 | cannot really deal with the individual consumer. |
| 8 | We don't have the X-ray equipment or physiological |
| • | equipment to know that much about what he knows |
| 10 | and what he doesn't know. We've got to use polls, |
| 11 | we've got to use surveys, we've got to use studies |

to get answers to questions like that.

Q. By asking people in surveys what information they had when they made a decision?

A. That's not always good enough. Surveys sometimes are not the best approach. It depends on the precise question. You are asking these broad, general questions and I'm trying to answer them in a broad, general manner but it depends precisely on what the specific question is that we are trying to measure. Sometimes a survey is not a good approach. Sometimes we need to use an experiment. Other times you need to use a survey.

Q. How do people retrieve awareness, sir, when you ask them a question as to what they were

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

12

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    aware of at a certain point in time?
 2
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
    of the question.
 3
 4
          I don't think that any of us know what the
 5
    physiological mechanism is of retrieval.
 6
          Q.
                Are there any hypotheses that you are
    aware of?
 7
          There's some little paper and pencil models
 8
 9
    but that's just to make life a little easier.
    guess I don't even know what retrieve awareness
10
11
    means. If I ask you have you ever heard about,
    have you ever heard about Life cigarettes and your
12
13
    brain spins away and thinks Life, Life, Life, have
    I ever heard of Life cigarettes, we have no idea
15
    what that brain process is for retrieval to answer
    that question. I don't think anyone knows. I
17
    think it will be decades until we even come close
18
    to answering that. In fact, that is a Nobel
19
    prize, if I've ever seen one, just sitting there
20
    waiting to be plucked off.
                Have you ever conducted any opinion
21
22
    surveys?
23
          Oh, yes.
24
                With regard to what, sir?
          The cigarette study that we talked about
```

waga and spinelli cartified shorthand reporters

```
105
    Kassarjian - direct
    again and again is an opinion survey.
                                            I worked
    for a year and a half for Facts Consolidated,
    which is a commercial survey organization. We did
    studies on a variety of products from Chung King
    Food to the New York Times to Richard Nixon the
    politician to Pat Brown the politician to
    propositions on ballots to the Automobile Club on
    you readership of their magazine. Who knows.
    Dozens of products, dozens of political and social
    issues in that year and a half.
10
                In your view of cigarette advertising,
11
          Q.
    have you ever seen a cigarette ad that you felt
12
13
    was deceptive?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
14
    of the question.
15
          Have I ever seen an ad of the thousands,
16
    maybe tens of thousands of ads I've ever seen that
17
    I's supposed to pull out of the air to say that
18
    was a deceptive ad?
19
                We are bordering on information
20
    retrieval here.
21
          Yes. I have no idea how to do it.
22
    did, I'd get the Robel Frize.
23
                We are working on the Nobel Frize
24
```

Let's just work on some questions

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
           Do you recall seeing an ad which you
    considered to be deceptive, a digarette ad that
 2
 3
    you considered to be deceptive? You don't have to
    tell me what the ad was. All I want is an answer
    as to whether or not you've ever considered any
    cigarette advertising to be deceptive.
 6
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
7
 8
    the guestion.
          I've never thought of it before.
3
                                             Pull out
    an ad, show it to me and I'll give you my
10
              I need to know the date that it was run.
    opinion.
11
                Why is that?
12
13
          I need to know the times, the era, because
    the meaning of an ad, the influence of an ad, its
14
    effect of an ad and what we mean by deception is
15
16
    that it has an affect that's different than the
            I would need to know whether it's true or
17
    not and then I need to know -- it's my zeitgeist
18
    that I keep coming back to.
                                 It's the times.
19
    critical, absolutely critical.
20
                Have you ever written a paper in
21
          2.
    relationship to the zeitgeist?
22
               It's just, that's not worth a paper.
23
    That's not a publishable piece. Everybody accepts
```

That's like saying people see better under

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

that.

107 Kassarjian - direct light than they see in the dark. 2 paper like that. I would make an ass of myself. 3 I wouldn't want you to do that. 4 Of course not. \$ At least not here. Is there any reference to zeitgeist in your 1964 paper? 7 The cigarette paper? 8 Yes. ٥. 9 I just read it in the telephone booth and I 10 don't remember it. Have you ever published any article 11 subsequent to your '64 article which has been 12 marked as Kassarjian Exhibit 1 in which you 13 expressed any of the opinions that you related to 15 us today concerning changes in statements or conclusions contained in Kassarjian Exhibit 1? 16 17 I never even thought about that until I 18 was a half hour before I had my lovely experience in the telephone booth. 19 Have you ever thought about the paper? 20 It was published. It's done. 21 I'm amazed that anybody digs up a 25 year old paper and drags it over the coals. 23 24 It was a paper regarding digarettes

Right, sir?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

and health hazards.

```
1
2
               MR. BLEAKLEY:
                              Object to the form of
3
   the question.
               Wasn't that the subject of the paper?
5
              The subject of the paper is cognitive
                Cigarettes and health hazards are an
   dissonance.
7
   example to prove, to show those points.
   other hand, the title does say that and I
9
   appreciate that some information retrieval service
```

- Q. You are participating in this case as an expert witness and this case, as you understand, involves cigarette smoking. Correct?

 A. Right.
- 15 Q. You understand that you are going to
 16 express opinions concerning testimony that's been
 17 offered by Dr. Cohen. Correct?
- 18 A. I'm going to answer questions that people
 19 ask. I don't know what people are going to ask me
 20 so how can I tell you what I'll answer unless I
 21 know the questions.
 - Q. You were asked to reviewed Dr. Cohen's transcript of his deposition?
 - A. Yes.

10

11

12

14

22

23

24

25

dug it up.

Q. You were asked to tell the lawyers

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|-----|--|
| 1 | whether there-were any things in the transcript |
| 2 | that you disagreed with. Correct? |
| 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | Q. You saw on the transcript Dr. Cohen's |
| 5 | use of the phrase cognitive dissonance, didn't |
| 6 | you? |
| 7 | A. It wasn't an important part of those five, |
| 8 | six hundred pages but I do remember seeing it, |
| 9 | yes. |
| . 0 | Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether |
| 11 | or not in 1964 people were adequately advised |
| . 2 | concerning the health hazards of cigarettes? |
| 1.3 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 4 | of the question. |
| . 5 | A. Adequately advised concerning the health |
| . 6 | hazards. As they were known at that time or as we |
| . 7 | know them to be today? Obviously they were not |
| 8 | adequately advised as to the problems of health |
| 9 | hazards in eigarette smoking for information that |
| 20 | was not known until today. For example, if it |
| 21 | causes liver damage or prostate cancer or colon |
| 22 | cancer or something which we didn't know about |
| 23 | then, how could they be advised of it? |
| 2 4 | Do you have an opinion as to whether |
| | |

```
Kassarjian - direct
advised concerning the health hazards of cigarette
smoking in 1963 for all of those diseases which
were then known to be related to digarette
smoking?
```

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question. I can't tell you about all of those diseases

because I don't know that all of those diseases were known. I can tell you this, that there was a great deal of information that cigarette smoking is not good for you. In fact, since the 1920s, we had information out there that cigarette smoking was not good for you.

In the 1930s I remember very clearly my grammar school coach even not allowing people who smoked to be on the football team. wanted to be a football player, you didn't saoke. We knew smoking wasn't good for you. We didn't know how bad it might be in those years.

By 1964 when you looked the ads, I think, and you talk to people at that point, I would be quite confident in stating that people knew cigarette smoking wasn't good. If you asked a specific illness, did this cause arthritis of 25 the fingernail, I don't know how much of that they

wags and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

```
Kassarjian - direct
    knew or if we talk about colon cancer, I don't
 1
 2
    know that.
                I don't know if they were adequately
    warned for specific diseases as you asked but I do
    know that cigarette smoking was not a nice thing
    as early as '64 and maybe as early as World War
    II.
                But you don't know what people knew or
    what they didn't know concerning the precise
    health hazards of cigarette smoking?
10
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
    of the question.
11
12
                Is that correct?
          In '64?
13
14
                In '63.
          No, I don't know what people did or did not
15
16
    know.
           I did not do a survey at that time to find
17
    out.
18
                Do you have an opinion as to whether
    or not it's the responsibility of a manufacturer
19
    to advise its consumers of hazards arising out of
20
    the use of their product?
21
22
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
23
    of the question.
24
          That's not my field.
25
               I suspect there's a whole body of case
```

```
112
    Kassarjian - direct
    law on that. "It's not my field.
1
                Have you ever expressed that opinion?
 2
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 3
    of the question.
 4
 5
          Who knows? After a couple of drinks at some
    cocktail party, who knows what kind of an opinion
 7
    I might have given. With a few drinks in me, I've
    got opinions about the czar, I've got opinions
 8
    about the Russians, and most of all I've got
9
    strong opinions about our president. Who knows if
10
    I've ever given an opinion on responsibility of a
11
12
    manufacturer.
                Do you have an opinion with respect to
13
    the effectiveness of warnings on products?
14
                MR. PARRISH:
                             Object to the form of
15
16
    the question.
          Do I have an opinion as to the
17
    effectiveness? What warning, what product?
18
    me and I'll give you an opinion, if I have one.
19
                Have you ever written papers
20
    concerning the effectiveness of warnings on
21
    products?
22
          No, I have not. I don't remember -- I've
23
    written a textbook in consumer behavior.
24
```

think I'm -- I'm virtually positive there's

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    nothing in there about the effectiveness of
    warning labels. If you found a sentence or a
    paragraph somewhere, I would like the right to say
 3
    whoops, I forgot.
                When was the last time you did any
          Q.
    original research?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 7
    of the question.
          Where I collected the data myself? Is that
    what you mean by original research?
10
                Where you designed and supervised an
11
    original research project in the field of consumer
12
   behavior.
13
          1982.
                 Since that time I was editor of the
14
    Journal of Consumer Research and my full-time
15
   responsibility was reading other people's
    research, criticizing it, sending it out for
17
   review and then publishing those papers that we
18
    felt were scientifically adequate and were making
    a contribution so the last real study I
20
    conducted -- that's not true. 1982 is the last
21
   article I published. I collected data on consumer
22
   behavior in May of 1987.
                In regard to what, sir?
24
```

That was in regard to ethical values among

waga and spinelli cartified shorthand reporters

25

```
114
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
    consumers and businessmen, ethical beliefs.
 2
                For the purposes of an article?
 3
          Yes.
                You were the primary individual
    responsible for designing and overseeing the
             Is that correct?
    survey.
                Not survey, the study.
                                         I designed the
    study, I invited an assistant professor at UCLA to
    join me and she got all excited about it and so
    she will be a co-author and will probably do some
10
    of the data processing when we are done with it.
11
    She is already on some content analyses and so I
12
13
    brought an assistant professor in with me.
                Have you ever written any articles
14
    criticizing cognitive dissonance?
15
16
    λ.
          No.
17
                Until your testimony here today as an
    expert witness in this case, have you ever
18
```

expert witness in this case, have you ever publically in any speech, forget about drinks at a party, but any speeches or in any lectures before your peers conveyed the opinion that you didn't think that cognitive dissonance was a valid theory today?

A. No, I would never say that. I don't believe

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

it's true.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

12

16

- 1 You believe that cognitive dissonance 2 is a valid theory?
- It's one of many, many explanations of human 3
- behavior and I accept it as another one.
- 5 Is it a valid explanation of consumer 6 behavior?
- 7 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question. 8
- 9 I think it has usefulness in some cases in other cases it doesn't make a lot of sense. 10 depends entirely on the specifics. I have nothing 11

against dissonance. In fact, I like Festinger.

- You have a problem with cognitive 13 dissonance in terms of cigarette smokers' beliefs and behavior with respect to cigarette smoking. 15 Is that correct?
- MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 17
- 18 of the question.
- My problem is that you are making too much 19
- of a small theory. You are looking for a handle 20
- to say the reason people do X is Y. In this case 21
- it is dissonance and in another case it would be 22
- something else. I'm saying we can't be that 23
- specific. We can't say the reason person A does X 24
- There are many reasons and one of 25 is reason Y.

wags and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    these explanations of how people behave,
 1
 2
    many, is cognitive dissonance.
                                     It's a very nice
 3
    theory.
                What are some of the other theories
 5
    that you subscribe to that would apply to
    understanding consumer behavior with regard to
    cidarette smoking?
 7
          Learning theory, classical conditioning,
    Freudian theory. It has all kinds of anal,
    Freudian anal overtones, sucking on phallic
10
                        I think that Horney's theories
    symbols and so on.
11
    could fit in here.
                        I think that a lot of the
12
    neoclassical Freudian theories, I think some of
13
14
    the social psychological theories could be brought
15
    to bear. I think one can, depending on what one
    is expert in, whether you are a Freudian or a
16
    learning theorist or a social psychologist, I
17
18
    think you will bring in your pet views of trying
    to understand human behavior and I'm saying they
19
    all have something to say, let's listen to them
20
    all.
21
22
                You think they are equally valid in
    understanding consumer behavior in terms of
23
    cidarette smoking?
24
```

MR. BLEAKLEY:

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

Objection to the form

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 of the question.
- 2 A. I don't know what equally valid is. They
- 3 are all approaches to trying to explain. If one
- 4 of these was the right way and the others were the
- 5 wrong way, then we would all be using that and we
- 6 are not. We are all over the place.
- 7 Q. Do you have an opinion as to which of
- 8 these various theories you believe would best be
- 9 used in understanding consumer behavior with
- 10 regard to cigarette smoking?
- 11 A. Deep in my belly I suspect that a
- 12 physiological theory, which probably hasn't been
- 13 invented yet, will probably come pretty close,
- 14 that it will have physiologic reactions rather
- 15 than social psychological or psychiatric reasons.
- 16 I think there's a physiological basis for
- 17 addiction here and I don't think we have that
- 18 theory yet. If you want to know what I think will
- 19 some day emerge, I think we will see physiological
- 20 research emerging but that's not my field. In
- 21 fact, I almost failed zoology.
- 22 g. What leads you to that conclusion?
- 23 A. You asked me my opinion. It's my gut
- 24 feeling.

25

Q. I want to know the basis for your

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

feeling.

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of the question.

I just think that when you come down to it, in the end we are talking physiology. You do that yourself although you don't realize it. You asked me about the retrieval of awareness or retrieval of knowledge or something. What does retrieval mean and what you are, I think, asking for is some little computer-like flow chart of that's not how people behave. People are chemicals and synapses and neurons and if you really want to know how people retrieve information, we have to know about the neurons and synapses and what's happening in the front lobes of the brain. It's a deep belief that in the end it's physiology. In the end it's neurons and chemistry.

Q. That will explain consumer behavior with respect to cigarette smoking?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

A. In the end I think that a lot of our behavior patterns can be brought down to a physiological response but we are many decades from that. These are philosophical questions.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|----|--|
| | • |
| 1 | They are better discussed over several bottles of |
| 2 | wine. |
| 3 | Q. Do you know about any research with |
| 4 | regard to the physiological response of cigarette |
| 5 | smokers to the use of cigarettes? |
| 6 | 1. No, I do not. There is some research on it |
| 7 | I know by having seen an article or two in the |
| 8 | paper but I know nothing about it. |
| 9 | Q. Here you provided by Philip Morris |
| 10 | with their internal research in this regard? |
| 11 | A. No, I have not been. |
| 12 | MR. PARRISH: Object. |
| 13 | Q. Were you aware that they have been |
| 14 | carrying on this type of consumer behavior type of |
| 15 | research with regard to the physiology of |
| 16 | cigarette smoking for some number of years? |
| 17 | MR. PARRISH: Object. |
| 18 | A. I have no idea. I've never heard of it |
| 19 | before but that isn't exactly the most unbiased |
| 20 | scientific source either, is it? |
| 21 | Q. I'll subscribe to that. |
| 22 | MR. EDELL: We might as well break for |
| 23 | lunch. |
| 24 | (Luncheon recess.) |
| | · |
| 25 | APTERNOON SESSION. |

Kassarjian - direct

- Q. Did you review any depositions of Rose Cipollone or any of her family members?
- 3 A. No, I did not.
- 4 Q. Did you review Professor Pollay's
- 5 deposition?
- 6 A. No, I did not.
- 7 Q. The only deposition transcripts that
- 8 you reviewed were those of Dr. Cohen's deposition?
- 9 A. The deposition? I don't know what
- 10 | transcript means.
- 11 Q. A deposition is the proceeding that
- 12 you and I are participating in. The transcript is
- 13 the little booklet that she prepares from the
- 14 deposition.
- 15 A. Yes. I read the Cohen transcript.
- 16 Q. We were furnished with notes that you
- 17 sade a various pages of the transcript. Here you
- 18 | furnished with the entire deposition transcript
- 19 for Dr. Cohen's depositions?
- 20 A. Yes. In three volumes. I had it all.
- 21 Q. There are no notes other than those
- 22 pages that we have been provided?
- 23 A. The other pages don't exist.
- 24 Q. You discarded them?
 - A. Yes. As I read through a page, if I had

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    something to say on it, I'd say it.
                                          Otherwise I'd
    throw it away.
2
                If you had no comments with respect to
3
    the testimony that Dr. Cohen offered on a
    particular page, then you would simply discard
        If you did have comments, then you wrote them
    down on the page itself?
                I can use my own copy?
8
                Certainly. The only caution I make is
9
    that if we mark yours as an exhibit, Dr.
10
    Kassarjian, then you will have the responsibility
11
    of making sure that the transcript stays intact
12
    and that you don't add any notes, that you don't
13
    change it in any way and that it's available at
14
    the time of trial.
15
          Do I give a dam? Do I want this for any
16
    conceivable reason? Anything you take away from
17
    me is something less I have to carry.
18
                It would be our pleasure.
19
                MR. EDELL: Would you mark that,
20
21
    please.
                (Kassarjian Exhibit 2 marked for
22
23
    identification.)
                Dr. Kassarjian, can you tell us what
24
    Kassarjian Exhibit 2 is?
```

```
122
    Kassarjian - direct
          Kassarjian Exhibit 2.
 1
                We marked the document as Kassarjian
 2
    Exhibit 2.
 3
          These are notes that I took on Joel Cohen's,
    the transcript of Joel Cohen's deposition.
    remaining pages I threw away.
 7
                When did you advise counsel that you
    had notes?
 8
 9
          On September S at two p.m.
                Did you furnish them with a copy of
10
    the notes at that time?
11
          Not until yesterday so we could Xerox them
12
    off for you.
14
                HR. BLEAKLEY:
                                That's not exactly
            We got copies of that from you last week
15
    and supplied it to you last week.
16
17
                MR. EDELL: You supplied it to me
    under cover letter I believe of October 20
18
                I don't remember the date.
19
    something.
                MR. BLEAKLEY: It wasn't yesterday.
20
                             It wasn't September 5.
                MR. EDELL:
21
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                               No, it wasn't September
22
23
24
```

yesterday.

```
123
    Kassarjian - direct
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Yes.
 1
    notes on the Pollay document.
                THE WITNESS: Fine.
                                      I'm wrong, as
 3
    usual.
                The second page of Kassarjian Exhibit
    2, does that record the hours that you spent on
7
    this case?
          Not on this case. On this transcript.
                Reviewing the transcript?
9
10
          Yes.
                When were you first contacted by
11
    someone representing one of the defendants in this
12
13
    case?
          My very, very first contact was sometime in
14
    maybe 1985.
15
                Who did you speak with at that time?
16
          It was a lawyer from San Francisco, Purvis,
17
    I believe, and I think he had a colleague with
    him. They came in and asked a lot of questions
19
    about cigarette smoking and information processing
20
    and who the leading experts in the country were on
21
    the topic.
22
```

What did you tell them?

I gave them whatever names I could think of.

You don't resember what those names

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

23

24

25

405 Northfield Avenue

201700676z

```
124
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
          You told me --
 2
          I mentioned Cohen.
                               I think I mentioned Duke
    University, Jim Bettman, Lynch, there was a fellow
 3
    named Lynch at Florida I think I mentioned and I
 5
    don't remember who else. I'm confabulating now
    thinking of what I said two years ago.
 7
          Q.
                Do you consider yourself to be an
 8
    expert in information processing?
 9
          No, not an expert.
                What is information processing?
10
11
          It's the latest or the next to latest fad in
    consumer behavior that emerged out of experimental
12
    psychology and social psychology on how people
13
    process information involving memory factors and
14
    recall of memory and some of the jargon you were
15
    using comes from the information processing
17
    literature. It's an area of study, particularly
18
    on memory, emerging out of social and experimental
19
    psychology.
20
                Have you written any papers on
    information processing?
21
          No. I have not.
22
                Have you read any papers on
23
          Q.
    information processing?
```

Information processing in its narrowest

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    sense, meaning memory retrieval, memory factors, I
 2
               I find lately that the word information
    processing is being used to cover the whole
    field. If in fact we are going to call the whole
    field of consumer behavior or dawn near the whole
    field information processing, then I've written
 7
    many papers on it so it depends how one defines
    the word information processing.
 8
                                     If we mean
 9
    experimental psychology, the answer is no, I have
10
    not written. If we broaden it out, then yes, I
11
    have written many papers.
12
                When you say this fad, do you consider
13
    information processing theory to be a fad as .
```

opposed to an accepted theory?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

It's just that research topics take on a character of being popular at certain points in time, depending on the era or the zeitgeist and at other times research topics tend to become popular and in the early 1980s information processing was a very popular topic for research, and that's what I mean by fad. Nothing more than that. Before it, it was attitudes and before that, it was personality and before that, it was perceived

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

risk.

1

2 Q. After that contact, when was your next
3 contact with the cigarette industry?

A. I think in early 1986, yes, early '86 I was contacted by Mr. Silfen. I think he came to Los Angeles once or twice because I was having some dental work done and I know I stood him up in my

8 office for hours and I think that was early '86

and again it was just this reaching out of what is

there in this field, what is it we should know

11 about, what's the field about.

12 Q. What field are you referring to?

13 A. Consumer behavior.

14 Q. What did you tell him?

15 A. I just told him, answered his questions. I

16 don't remember what the questions were.

17 Q. You said he asked you what they should 18 know with respect to the field of consumer

19 behavior. What did you tell him?

20 A. I may have given him some articles to read.

21 I don't remember.

o. What articles?

23 A. Probably some articles I had written.

24 Whatever I had in my office. I really don't

25 remember.

22

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

Q. Go ahead.

1

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 Then I went to, somewhere there was another meeting in Washington where I ran into Silfen in early 1986. All I knew at the time is that they didn't know what was going on, they didn't know --I was told they didn't know what was happening, if there would be a trial, who the witnesses would be and what it would be about and they were just gathering information and then the next time I got -- that was early '86. Then I wasn't 10 contacted again until 1987, somewhere in maybe 11 late July of '87, about a year and a quarter there 12 13 I had no contact.

Q. In addition to the transcript of Dr. Cohen, what other materials did you review with respect to your opinions in this case?

A. In the summer of '87, I had the follay report. Then in August of '87 I got the Cohen deposition. It might have been that in '86 or '85, somewhere I have some other stuff. I have a couple of Xerox articles, something about women and smoking and I think I had an article by somebody else, Warner, Werner, somebody, which I skimmed and decided it wasn't relevant to me and

put it aside and have promptly forgotten.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

I think there was an article, I think
there was a stack of stuff which I thought was
kind of fun to read and then ignored it, Calfey,
Cavey, an FTC report, which I had looked at and
thought there was historical stuff that was
interesting when cigarette advertising started and
skinned it and put it aside and forgot about it.

Then there were a few ads, about six Xerox copies of six or seven ads which are kind of fun to look at because old ads are always kind of fun to look at. That's it as far as I can remember.

- Q. Let's go through Kassarjian Exhibit 2 so that I can understand your handwriting and what your comments relate to. We are on page 96, sir.
- Q. Can you read to us your comments in the left-hand column and what those comments refer to?
- 20 A. "Advertising alone" is a question mark. I
 21 was reacting to something that was written here
 22 and I can't pick it up. "The information
 23 environment would be a largely positive one in
 24 regard to the positive associations with regard to
 25 smoking." I think I was saying does he mean to

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    imply advertising alone was the information
    environment. It was more of a question mark.
 2
                                                    The
    last statement by Cohen is that the information
 3
    regarding digarettes and underemphasized health
    related concerns about cigarettes, I said yes,
    they may have been underemphasized but the
 6
    health-related concerns are there.
 7
                                        They were
 8
    clearly there.
 9
                Then my comment on the bottom is an
    editorial, which merely says, "All health
    advertising implies something is wrong." I got
11
12
    here my little McDonald hamburger example, that
    every time you say less irritating in an ad or you
13
    say contains less tar, what you are implying is
    the product contains tar but this product, this
15
16
    brand contains less than the other brand. You are
    reminding people of the health danger of the
17
    product. Every ad with its little FTC disclaimer,
18
    whatever that's called, on the bottom, the viewer
19
    that there are health dangers in the cigarette.
20
21
                What studies did you perform in order
          Q.
    to come to that conclusion?
22
23
          I performed no studies at all. It's based
    entirely on my 25, 30 years of experience in this
```

field and the hundreds of studies that have been

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

Kassarjian - direct written and studied in other areas. 1 information has a strong impact. One of them I 2 mentioned was a series of studies on McDonald's WOTES. You've done no studies in order to 5 determine what impact the tar and nicotine figures 7 have on consumers. Is that correct? That's not even my field. The impact of tar 8 9 and nicotine is a medical or physiologic, biologic 10 field of study, not consumer study. I said the figures in advertising. 11 ٥. You referred to the Federal Trade Commission 12 numbers with respect to nicotine and tars. Did 13 you do any study in order to ascertain what impact 14 15 those figures have on people? I have not conducted any studies on 16 No. this project at all. 17 Aside from this project, have you ever 18 conducted a study to determine what impact those 19 figures in advertising have on people who read the 21 ads? No. Let me broaden that and say I've done 22 no studies on cigarettes or cigarette advertising 23 except the 1964 study, which everyone is claiming 24

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07082 201-731-9666

is about digarettes when in fact it is not.

Kassarjian - direct

Q. Page 103.

A. I've written, "Talks about big picture, novel, movies, books but focus on advertising."

In this point what I'm trying to say is that Cohen has been talking about either here or on the pages before about things like the information environment and all of the influences that are in the information environment on the individual but he keeps focusing in on just one little piece of that, advertising, rather than novels or movies, books and TV shows and radio programs and all of the other things that go into the information environment. What I'm saying below that is that advertising is fine but it's a minor part of the gestalt, the totality that surrounds smoking.

Q. What studies show that advertising is a minor part of the information environment?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

A. There are no studies that I've conducted or have read that discuss that issue. This is not an important issue to the world.

Q. Your opinion that advertising has only a minor effect on the information environment is simply based upon your experience as opposed to

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

132

Kassarjian - direct any actual research that you've conducted." Is that correct, sir? 2 3 That's correct. If there is an ambiguous information 5 environment, how does that affect consumers? 6 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question. I haven't got the vaguest idea what ambiguous information environment means. If there is information, for example, 10 with respect to cigarettes that cigarette smoking 11 and its relationship to diseases has not been 12 proven and there's also information that it has 13 been proven that digarette smoking causes 15 diseases, how will that effect consumers? 16 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 17 of the question. That's simply not ambiguous. 18 I don't believe there's any ambiguity at all. I don't 19 20 think there's been any ambiguity since World War II. Sackers and non-sackers alike know that 21 cigarettes was not a safe, healthy product. 22

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

always known that.

may not be bad for you.

that but we know it isn't good for you.

23

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

We may not be sure of

The consumer has always known

cigarette smoking is not good for you. That's not ambiguous.

- Q. Have digarette smokers always understood how bad digarette smoking might be?

 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.
- A. I don't know what they understood. I do know that even today we don't know how bad it might be. That's something to find out in the long-run.
 - Q. Page 107.

Kassarjian - direct

A. On the bottom I said, "Survey from early 1900s of stories about smoking in popular press unpublished." Pollay has apparently written a very interesting, what appears to be an interesting paper on the history of advertising and he surveyed the literature, I gathered from this, from the 1900s about all the stories about advertising, about smoking in the popular press, but it's unpublished, 1987, so I jotted this down to myself thinking gee, I bet that would be interesting to see that, I wonder how one gets hands on something that's unpublished and not available to real people so that was just notes to myself.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

1

- Q. Next page, 121.
- 2 A. The comment here is, "Dr. Cohen is expected
- 3 to testify that tobacco industry marketing and
- 4 advertising are significantly responsible for
- 5 creating the described information environment for
- 6 cigarettes." I thought that was an
- 7 overstatement. I at that point could not imagine
- 8 that Cohen would testify that advertising and
- 9 advertising alone is significantly responsible for
- 10 creating an information environment. I thought
- 11 that was just lawyer hyperbole.
- 12 Q. Where does it say that digarette
- 13 advertising and cigarette advertising alone are
- 14 significantly responsible for creating the
- 15 described information environment for eigarettes?
- MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 17 of the question.
- 18 A. You asked me what the overstatement is and
- 19 I'm telling you why I wrote the word
- 20 overstatement. It's because I thought this was an
- 21 overstatement of the facts, that advertising -- I
- 22 don't want to quibble about the point. That isn't
- 23 it. That's why I wrote the word overstatement.
- 24 That's what I understood.
 - Q. In what way does it overstate

wags and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
135
     Kassarjian - direct
     advertising's effect on the information
     environment for cigarettes?
            "Advertising is significantly responsible
  3
     for creating the described information
     environment," I think is wrong. It is not
     significantly responsible. It may have a very
 7
     small effect, a small vector.
                                    We can't deny that
     some advertising sometimes has some effect.
     don't mean to do that by any means.
                                           On the other
     hand, to state that advertising is significantly
10
     responsible for creating a zeitgeist, an
11
12
     information environment, is an overstatement, I
13
     feel.
                 Is reitgeist the same as information
14
           Q.
     environment?
15
                 MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Objection to the form
16
     of the question.
17
           I don't know what information environment
18
             That's jargon that Cohen has developed.
19
                 What is Joel Cohen's reputation in the
20
     field of consumer behavior?
21
           I have not done a study.
                                      I can tell you my
. 22
    opinion of Joel Cohen.
23
24
                 First I want to find out whether or
    not he has a reputation in the community, not
25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
   whether you've done a poll but whether or not you
   have an understanding as to how his peers view him
2
    in the area of his expertise in consumer behavior.
 3
          Yes, he is one of the starters of the
    field. He is very intelligent. I'm sure people
   will agree he is a very intelligent person.
                            Whatever his opinions are,
7
   holds strong opinions.
   he holds them very, very strongly.
                                        To me he is a
2
   very close and dear friend of thirty years and I
9
10
    have great respect for the man.
                Have you testified in a case with him
11
          Q.
    at a11?
12
          He once called me on the phone and asked me
13
    who I thought some of the really best content
14
    analysis researchers in the country were,
15
    particularly from the field of communications,
16
    research and sociology, and I talked a bit about
17
    Arhenberg's school in Pennsylvania and was trying
1 B
    to think of some of the old names and then he said
19
    something about cigarettes and cigarette smoking
20
    and so I said Joel, shut up, hang on, I don't
21
    think you want to talk to me on this, are you
22
    working on a case, and I think he said yes.
23
    said is it for the defense or whatever the other,
    somehow I asked him, I can never remember who the
```

Kassarjian - direct

- 1 plaintiffs and the other guys are but I was pretty
- 2 | sure it was a cigarette case. I had no idea it
- 3 would be this one, the one I had talked to these
- 4 guys, but I said Joel, I've talked to these
- 5 | people, let's not talk about it any more and he
- 6 | said all right but I don't think that's an
- 7 important problem. I just want to know who you
- 8 think some of the best people in the country are
- 9 and so we talked a couple of more minutes and I
- 10 | said Joel, let's not talk about this topic again
- 11 and that ended it. I've seen him several times
- 12 since then and neither of us have brought the
- 13 topic up. We are smarter than that.
- 14 Q. How many cases have you acted as an
- 15 expert witness in?
- 16 A. Once or twice a year, once a year, one and a-
- 17 half times a year maybe.
- 16 Q. For how many years?
- 19 1. Ten, fifteen.
- 20 Q. You've participated in approximately
- 21 | twenty cases?
- 22 A. Ten, fifteen, twenty, yes, I don't remember.
- 23 Q. You don't know the difference between
- 24 | the plaintiffs and the defendants in a case?
- MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
138
     Kassarjian - direct
     of the question.
            I just don't bother.
                                  I don't care.
  2
     makes no difference to me.
  3
                                  The good guys and bad
     guys is what I usually call them.
                  Who are the good guys and who are the
  5
           Q.
     bad duys in this case?
  7
           The side I'm on is the good guys and the
     other side are the bad guys. What do you call
  9
     them?
           I don't know.
                  How much do you charge in these cases?
 10
           $200 an hour.
 11
 12
                 Do you do other consulting work?
 13
           Very seldos.
 14
                 When was the last time you acted as a
 15
     consultant outside of the area of litication?
 16
           For pay or because someone -- people are
 17
     constantly calling me and I try to palm them off
 18
     because I don't like consulting.
 19
                  When was the last time somebody paid
     you to act as a consultant, 'sir?
 20
 21
           A bunch of years. A long time.
                  A bunch of years, five, ten, fifteen,
. 22
     twenty?
 23
              How Bany?
```

Five.

٥.

24

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

Turn to page 122.

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 A. Okay. On top is the word pot. Somewhere
- 2 Cohen had been talking about the fact that
- 3 cigarette advertising was responsible for getting
- 4 people to smoke digarettes or something to that
- 5 effect and my thought was if that's the case, how
- 6 do you explain popularity of marijuana where
- 7 there's been no advertising or of snorting cocaine
- 8 where there's been no advertising so that's what
- 9 the word pot means, just a reminder to myself that
- 10 if Joel goes out too far on claiming that
- 11 advertising is entirely responsible for cigarette
- 12 smoking, then I wonder how he would explain the
- 13 | popularity of marijuana.
- 14 g. Do you have an opinion as to whether
- 15 or not if marijuana or cocaine were legalized and
- 16 if the volume of advertising was similar to that
- 17 of cigarette advertising it would affect the use
- 18 of marijuana and cocaine?
- 19 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 20 of the question.
- 21 A. I don't have the vaguest idea. There's too
- 22 many ifs in there.
- 23 g. Do you know when cigarettes first were
- 24 | advertised?
- 25 A. There's a fellow named Burt Raven, a

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- psychologist, who has gathered all the old
 advertising of cigarettes and I have heard him
- 3 talk on that and I think it was at the turn of the
- 4 century but it was based on his speech, not on
- 5 knowledge of my own.
- 6 Q. Have you done any analysis of
 7 increased expenditures in advertising by cigarette
 8 manufacturers and the consumption of cigarettes?
- 9 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 10 of the question.
- 11 A. No, I haven't.
- 12 Q. Would you find that information useful
- 13 in formulating your opinions in this case?
- 14 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 15 of the question.
- 16 A. The information you are talking about is
- 17 advertising expenditures?
- 18 Q. Yes.
- 19 A. No, I don't care.
- 20 Q. Would you find it useful to ascertain
- 21 the circulation and frequency of advertising with
- 22 respect to its relationship to any increases or
- 23 decreases or changes at all in the consumption of
- 24 | cigarettes?

25

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

```
Kassarjian - direct
     of the question.
           No, I would not believe those data. I don't
  2
     think that there is data that can show you that
     advertising has an effect, positive or negative,
     on the consumption increase or decrease of smoking
     or any other product. The only place where I
     would back off on that is mail order advertising
     where you run the ad and you know how many orders
     come in, but any other kind of advertising, any
 10
     measure of effectiveness is inaccurate and
     inadequate.
 11
                 Is it your opinion that advertising
 12
           Q.
     does not increase sales?
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 14
 15
     of the question.
 16
           No, I will not make that claim.
 17
                 Do you know whether or not advertising
     for a product increases sales?
 18
           That cannot be answered. In some conditions
 19
     where we can measure it like sail order
 20
     advertising, mail order catalog advertising, we
 21
    can go ahead and measure and see what the effect
. 22
 23
     of advertising to sales are. In a very few other
     conditions like Lydia Finkham's menstrual pain
     medicine, there is some reasonable data on the
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
  1
     relationship between advertising and sales.
     Nowhere else is that data found where those kind
  2
     of claims are made or can be refuted.
  3
                 Page 122, is that an overstatement
           Q.
  5
     again, sir?
           "If it wasn't for the marketing and
     advertising of cigarettes, there wouldn't be much
  7
     of an information environment regarding
  8
  9
     cidarettes.
                  The tobacco companies were the prime
     movers." If I understand that statement, Joel is
 10
 11
     saying that the tobacco companies is what created
     the information environment or what I'm calling
 12
     creating the zeitgeist and you can't give tobacco
 13
     companies or anyone else that kind of credit.
 14
     we could give them that kind of credit, they
 15
     should be billionaires. Well, I guess they are.
 16
                 What's the next comment, sir?
 17
           Let me read it. "Just like movie producer,
 18
     advertising picking up on the existing gestalt,
 19
     the existing reitgeist." What I'm saying here is
 20
     that what advertisers are doing is they are
 21
     sensitive to the direction, the times they are in
. 22
     and the kind of advertising they are doing and the
 23
     messages and the appeals they are getting to is
 24
     reflecting that zeitgeist, that gestalt of the
```

```
times. Movie producers will do this to get some
kind of effect so right now we see an awful lot of
advertising toward yuppies because this is the era
of yuppies so there's all kinds of advertising for
athletic shoes and yuppy food and yuppy clothes
and so on. They are cashing in on the times.

O. Are you aware that manufacturers pay
```

Kassarjian - direct

8

9

10

13

1 6

- Q. Are you aware that manufacturers pay producers of films to use their products?

 MR. BLEXKLEY: Objection to the form
- MR. BLENKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.
- MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of the question.
 - A. I have no idea what the motion picture industry does or doesn't do.
- 15 Read your next comment on page 122. . Somewhere Cohen is talking about advertising 16 17 and sometimes he means advertising and sometimes 18 he means marketing and it's not clear from his deposition just where the lines are on advertising 19 and marketing so I jotted some of the things I 20 would put in marketing but not call advertising as 21 I was thinking about what he had been saying, . 22
 - 22 I was thinking about what he had been saying,
 23 package, coupons, promotion, product, place,
- 24 price, free gifts are all part of marketing and 25 promotion but are not advertising and so it was

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

. 22

23

24

25

just mumbling to myself on divisions.

- Q. Do these other forms of marketing contribute to the information environment?
 A. They are part of it. Do they contribute to
 it? Everything contributes to it. We'll give
 everybody credit. They can all have it.
 - Q. Page 126.
- g. "Perhaps but very small role." Cohen here says marketing and advertising had a major role leading up to some development. I remember what I wanted to say, that advertising and marketing may have a role in changing the times and attitudes and so on but it's just a small role. At best it's a small role. We cannot call it a major role, a prime mover, the cause. These kind of things I think are overstatements.
- Q. What research do you base that statement on?
- a. On 25 years of experience on all forms of consumer behavior that are in the literature.
- Ave evaluated advertising on the information environment?
- A. I can't give you any specific studies.
 - Q. Let's move on to your next consent.

Kassarjian - direct

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. "Exaggerated to give that much credit to advertising." What I was saying is he was giving too much credit to advertising. Now let's see what he said. (Examining document.) He is saying that it was marketing and advertising that were largely responsible. It's these gross words, largely, most, prime, that I'm objecting to, but "largely responsible for creating a symbolic association of cigarettes with lifestyles and glamour and sophistication, et cetera.

I don't believe it was marketing and advertising. It was the social setting. the times that gave smoking its lifestyle and its glamorous view. It was Talullah Bankhead smoking a cigarette. It was Bette Davis in a movie smoking a cigarette that started to make it glamorous. Cigarette smoking was the way that women could show in the twenties and thirties that they had become liberated from being under the thumbs of their daddies and that they were now adult and so all of these contributed and advertisers jumped on and showed digarette smoking in glamorous positions with liberated women. That's fine but to say that it was advertising that caused glamour or whatever is saying too

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| | 146 |
|----|--|
| | Kassarjian - direct |
| 1 | auch. It may have been part of it but it didn't |
| 2 | cause anything. It was reflecting the times and |
| 3 | the glamour of digarette smoking, not causing it |
| 4 | in my opinion. |
| 5 | Q. What, if any, role did marketing and |
| 6 | advertising have in the creation of symbolic |
| 7 | associations of cigarettes with lifestyle, glamour |
| 8 | and sophistication? |
| 9 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 10 | of the question. |
| 11 | A. It was a question I thought I just |
| 12 | answered. It jumped on the bandwagon. It might |
| 13 | have added a little bit. Let's give it a little |
| 14 | bit of credit after all but not largely or mostly |
| 15 | or prize, not those kind of words. |
| 16 | Q. What, if any, effect did the symbolic |
| 17 | association of cigarettes with lifestyle and |
| 18 | glamour and sophistication have on the information |
| 19 | processing of individuals with respect to |
| 20 | information regarding the health hazards of |
| 21 | cigarettes? |
| 22 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 23 | of the question. |
| 24 | A. I didn't understand the question. I don't |
| 25 | even understand exactly what you mean by |

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    information processing.
                              If you mean the whole
    field of consumer behavior or what, I don't know.
 2
 3
                 The new fad that we were talking about
    before.
 5
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
    of the question. .
 7
          In that case, I don't understand the
 A
    question at all.
 9
                Next page, 127.
10
          What I have written is, "Not conclusive that
    advertising is the major culprit but one small
11
    vector reflecting the times, the zeitgeist."
12
13
    I'm getting bored with that term. Not that
    advertising is the major culprit is basically what
14
    I'm saying but I don't know what I'm reacting to.
15
    (Examining document.)
16
17
                Is there any way to conduct a study to
          Q.
    see whether or not conclusively advertising was
18
19
    the major culprit?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
20
21
    of the question.
          Even the thought I find alien. The study if
22
    it was the major culprit, of course not.
23
    are so many factors, then you could have said is
24
    there any way to do a study to find out if
25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
   interpersonal communication or what sorority
    sisters were saying was the major culprit.
                        Advertising is one of these
    were many factors.
    many, many factors.
                What's the major cause of people
    beginning to use digarettes?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
7
   of the question.
8
          Social interaction with others, peer group.
9
                What study did you perform in order to
10
    conclude that that was the main cause?
11
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
12
    of the question.
13
          I have not conducted any studies.
14
                How would you devise a study to reach
15
    that conclusion?
16
          I can't sit here in the atmosphere of a
17
    deposition and devise a study for you.
18
                Let's take a look at page 128.
19
          What I meant to say here -- again I'm not
20
    sure of the context -- but what I said here is
21
    that Joel is backing off on a statement he has
22
    made. He may have been listening to himself and
23
    he is backing off from his statements.
24
    wiggling a little bit.
25
```

```
149
    Kassarjian - direct
                In regard to what?
 1
 2
          I don't know. Hang on. (Examining
 3
    document.) "I don't think you could expect to
    find any statement that said specifically that
    because a given digarette company produced a
    certain symbolic association for a cigarette, such
    and such filamaker picked that up and used in a
    given movie." What he said before is that
    advertising is the prime mover to the times.
    he is backing off from that and saying I don't
10
    think you are going to find any kind of a
11
    statement that specifically says it was
12
    advertising that was the prime mover, it was
    advertising that caused movie producers to give a
14
    cigarette to Talullah Bankhead or Bette Davis, it.
15
16
    was advertising that caused anything, and it's
    that statement he is backing off from.
17
18
                Page 146.
          He turns around and gives too such credit to .
19
    advertisers in my opinion. . He turns around.
20
                                                   What
    he is saying is that, "The major responsibility
21
    for the existence of the information environment
22
    in the first place needs to be placed at the door
23
```

of the tobacco industry." I can't accept that.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

Joel is a very

He can go ahead and think it.

Kassarjian - direct smart person but to give credit at the door of the tobacco industry for creating an entire era for smoking, gosh, if only advertisers could do that, if only advertisers could control the world that 5 way. 6 Q. Where is era, e-r-a? 7 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 8 of the question. 9 Where does Joel Cohen use that term? MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 10 11 of the question. 12 That's my term. Where does it say in this deposition 13 14 that it's Dr. Cohen's opinion that the major responsibility for the era in which people were ' 15 16 smoking should be placed at the door of the 17 tobacco industry? 18 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 19 of the question.

A. The quote is, "The major responsibility for the existence of the information environment in the first place needs to be placed at the door of the tobacco industry." Let me rephrase my answer by saying to give the advertising industry credit for creating an information environment of this

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

20

21

22

23

24

```
Kassarjian - direct
  1
     sort I think is an overstatement.
  2
                  Page 148?
           Q.
  3
           My statement is, "Disagree that these are
     differences" and then later I say, "Car and
     cigarettes not that different." Here he is
  5
     talking about a car example and doesn't like
  7
     comparing cars with cigarettes so that it's just a
  8
     lot of mumbling here about automobiles and cars
     and cigarettes and I thought that advertising for
  9
     cars and digarettes were not all that different.
 10
     It's a minor kind of comment. Later someone
 11
     switches him to coffee, whoever the questioner is,
 12
     says what about coffee, and as I remember, it
 13
     comes later, Cohen says coffee is more like it and
     so it was just mumbling to myself as I was reading
 15
          Nothing significant.
 16
                 Let's take a look at your sumbling on
           ο.
 17
 18
     149.
                                 Objection to the form
                 MR. BLEAKLEY:
 19
     of the question.
 20
                 I meant that in jest, Dr. Kassarjian.
 21
     I hope you took it that way.
. 22
            "Can't answer question."
 23
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: I meant my objection in
 24
            I hope you took it that way.
 25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

1 MR. EDELL: I always take it that way,

2 Mr. Bleakley.

My comment on page 149 is, "Can't answer 3 question, chicken-egg problem, can't measure. Cohen is flopping around. " What's the point? (Examining document.) He's being asked some of these impossible questions again. asked what research would you conduct if you wanted to see if coffee was a prize mover in the information environment, if advertising was a 10 prime mover in the information environment for 11 coffee and it's another one of these unanswerable 12 questions and so Joel does his best and he kind of 13 flops around and he really can't answer it because 14

you don't know what comes first; is it the advertising that comes first, is it the coffee that comes first, and poor Joel like me is just struggling to give an answer to a question that is

19 | unanswerable.

22

20 Q. Let's take a look at page 155.

21 A. Page 155, the words I have written are,

"Fine, I agree, but minimizing something out

23 consequence-low cough, irritation. I haven't the

24 vaguest idea what that means. (Examining

25 document.) He was asked a question. I don't know

waga and spineili certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    what the heck the question was. What he basically
    said is that, he is testifying that in his opinion
 2
    the information environment of the time ignored,
    denied or minimized the health-related
    consequences of smoking. That was it.
 5
    statement was that he felt that advertising at the
. 7
    time, I don't know when the time is --
                I think the question appears to be at
    the top of page 155.
 9
10
          Right. Joel said yes, felt that at the time
    the information environment and he means by that
11
    advertising plus everything else, ignored, denied
12
    or minimized the health-related consequences of
13
14
    smoking. My reaction is fine, I agree but
    minimizing is not the same as not including
15
    because advertising at that time, if I remember it
16
    correctly, although I was pretty young, had a lot
17
    of advertising like, "Not a cough in the carload,"
18
    less throat irritation, one of them had something
19
    about a T-Zone, less irritation in the T-Zone,
20
21
    snoke cools because they are cooler.
                Every time one of these ads come
22
    along, Smoke cools because it's less irritating"
23
    or "Smoke Camels because it irritates your T-Zone
24
25
    less," what that ad is saying in a very real sense
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
    is these products are irritating, they are not
 1
    good products; however, ours is better than the
 2
    competition and so these are brand switching type
 3
          They're saying less irritating does not mean
    not irritating.
                     It means cigarettes are
    irritating and ours is less than our competitors
 7
    so smoke ours.
                That's what I mean by yes, the health
 9
    hazards were minimized in the forties but the
10
    claim that there was no, the claim that people did
    not know that cigarette smoking is bad for you is
11
    just not true.
                   They knew. Look at the ads.
12
    will tell you they knew.
13
                What studies did you perform in order
14
    to come to that conclusion?
15
16
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
```

I performed no studies at all.

What types of studies could you perform in order to confirm. your judgment in that regard?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the of the question.

I would have to think about the answer I can't under these that at some length.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters.

of the question.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
155
     Kassarjian - direct
  1
     conditions.
                 Did you perform a content analysis of
  2
     the advertising in the 1940s?
  3
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
  5
     of the question.
           That would be one way to answer your
  6
  7
     question.
                                He asked you if you
  8
                 MR. BLEAKLEY:
     did.
 9
           No, I did not. Can I back up?
10
                                          I didn't look
     perform a formal content analysis.
11
     at some ads in an informal manner much as a
12
    reporter or analyst would look at them or a layman
13
     would look at them and draw those conclusions.
14
                 But you didn't do a formal content
15
     analysis in a scientific and objective fashion
 16
     that would be accepted in the field of consumer
17
                Is that right?
18
     behavior.
           I did not.
 19
                 Look at page 156.
20
           My handwriting if I can read it is, "No, can
 21
     discuss environment and how people in general may
22
     have perceived but not any given individual."
23
                 Now, what did he say? (Examining
 24
 25 | document.) Oh, poor Joel, he has gotten carried
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
     out on a limb in the questioning and he
  1
     dangling there on this limb.
                                    What he has been
     turned around into claiming is that he can, by
  3
     looking at whatever he was looking at, the
  5
     evidence that she is provided, that he knows what
     some individual, single individual's perceptions
  7
     were 45 years ago on some statements he has seen
     and I just deeply feel that you cannot do that.
     Not any given individual.
                                We may be able to talk
     about a group of individuals.
                                     We may be able to
 10
     say something about a class of individuals but to
 11
 12
     make any kind of claims about what a single
     individual thought, perceived, saw 45 years
13
     earlier, the poor guy is out on a limb.
 14
     asked the questions hung him there.
 15
                 Regardless of what information he had
 16
           ٥.
     available, sir?
 17
           I don't know what information he had
 18
     available. On the other hand, I just can't
 19
     imagine he could have sufficient information
 20
     available to have made these claims.
 21
. 22
           Q.
                 Mrs. Cipollone's deposition would not
```

of the question.

23

24

25

help him in this regard?

MR. BLEAKLEY:

405 Northfield Avenue West Orangs, N. J. 07052 201-731-9668

Objection to the form

| KASSA | 123 | Lan | - | 41: | rec' | ļ |
|-------|-----|-----|---|-----|------|---|
|-------|-----|-----|---|-----|------|---|

- 1 A. I've not read Mrs. Cipolione's deposition.
- 2 However, I can't imagine that a deposition, when
- 3 an individual answers those questions and only
- 4 those questions that a hostile questioner is
- 5 asking is the kind of information that would give
- 6 you enough richness to answer this question about
- 7 how a single individual 45 years before perceived
- 8 an ad.
- 9 Q. Why do you say that, sir?
- 10 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 11 of the question.
- 12 A. Because that's what I believe.
- 13 Q. Based upon what?
- 14 A. Based upon my entire knowledge of what we
- 15 know about individuals and consumer behavior and
- 16 psychology.

25

- 17 Q. What do you know about the proceeding
- 18 with regard to Rose Cipollone's deposition?
- 19 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 20 of the question.
- 21 A. I know nothing about Rose Cipollone. In
- 22 fact, I didn't even know it was pronounced that
- 23 way. I thought it was Rose Sipollone (phonetic)
- 24 so I know nothing about her deposition.
 - Q. What do you know about Rose Cipollone?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - ._direct

- 1 A. Nothing. She is some lady that's suing 2 somebody.
- 3 Q. What do you know about the information 4 that Joel Cohen had with regard to Rose Cipollone?
- 5 A. I know, don't ask how, but I know he had her
- 6 deposition. I believe, based on the statements
- 7 | that I remember from his deposition, that's all he
- 8 knew about Rose Cipollone.
- 9 Q. What other information did Joel Cohen
- 10 had when he concluded that he could testify with
- 11 regard to what Rose Cipollone's likely perceptions
- 12 were in the 1940s?
- MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 14 of the question.
- 15 A. I have no idea what he had. I believe that
- 16 | he only had her deposition but I know nothing
- 17 | else.
- 18 Q. It's your testimony that based upon
- 19 that, he could not conclude what her likely
- 20 perceptions were in the 1940s. Is that right?
- 21 A. No, it isn't.
- 22 Q. What is your testimony?
- 23 A. My testimony is that I cannot imagine what
- 24 information he could possibly have to allow him to
- 25 | conclude that.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
159
    Kassarjian - direct
                Is it your testimony that there is no
 1
          Q.
    way for us to determine what Rose Cipollone
 2
    perceived in the 1940s?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
    of the question.
          There's no reliable or valid way that I know
 7
    of.
                Is there any way to determine what
    Rose Cipollone's perceptions were in the 1950s?
10
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
11
    of the question.
          There's no valid way that I can think of.
12
                Is there any way to determine what
13
    Rose Cipollone's perceptions were in the 1960s?
14
15
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
16
    of the question.
17
               It's still too long ago.
          No.
18
                Is there any way for us to determine
    the perceptions of Rose Cipollone in the 1970s?
19
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
20
    of the question.
21
22
          No.
                Is there any way for us to determine
23
    what Rose Cipollone's perceptions were in the
  11980=?
25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

1 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

- 2 of the question.
- 3 A. If it's in the very recent past, perhaps,
- 4 just perhaps, by long-depth interviewing and other
- 5 psychological and projective techniques, perhaps
- 6 it's possible to get an inkling of what she was
- 7 perceiving in the recent past but in the long way
- 8 past, no way, Jose.
- 9 Q. When you say perceptions, did you mean
- 10 to include here beliefs?
- 11 A. Anything you want to include, any
- 12 psychological factors you want to include,
- 13 beliefs, perceptions, values.
- 14 Q. Attitudes?
- 15 A. Attitudes, yes.
- 16 Q. Knowledge?
- MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 18 of the question.
- 19 A. I'm willing to throw that in except that
- 20 I've got this distinct feeling you are sucking se
- 21 into a trap so I shall wiggle a little bit.
- . 22 Q. You do whatever you think is
 - 23 necessary, sir. I'm not trying to put you into a
 - 24 trap. I'm trying to find out what the truth is.
 - 25 A. Knowledge also.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

- 1 Q. Page 157, we don't have any notes on 2 there but we do have underlining.
- 3 A. Yes. That's a bad habit I have. I read
- 4 with my pencil and I write comments and I
- 5 | underline things. Especially if I didn't
- 6 understand a sentence, I'll go back and word by
- 7 | word underline as I'm trying to understand it.
- 6 That's all it means.
- 9 Q. Do you have any comments with regard 10 to Dr. Cohen's testimony which appears on page
- 11 | 157?
- 12 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 13 of the question.
- 14 A. Not that I can remember.
- 15 Q. Page 158.
- 16 A. My comments are, "Okay-perceptions-recall
- 17 and Pollay-not enough. Implies advertising
- 18 carries the weight of information environment.
- 19 Going too far."
- 20 Let me see what this is about.
- 21 (Examining document.) He is talking about
- 22 something about recall here. My comment is that
- 23 he is implying somewhere that advertising is
- 24 carrying the weight, the entire weight of the
- 25 information environment, what I'm calling the

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    zeitgeist, the times, the knowledge that's out
 1
 2
    there and the information that's out in the real
 3
    world and the weight of that is being carried by
    advertising and I just think that's gone a little
 5
    bit too far.
                  That's all.
 6
          Q.
                What does the okay refer to?
 7
          Okay, that's fine.
                              Let's see.
                                           (Examining
 8
    document.)
                There's a statement here that says, "I
    feel it's appropriate to look not only at what
 9
    Rose Cipolione recollects but also at the content
    of advertising of the period to see if her
11
    recollections and the content are consistent."
12
    I said okay, look at them.
                Is that accepted scientific research
14
15
    in the area of consumer behavior?
16
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
17
    of the question.
18
          To see if a person's recollections of
    something and what was really out there are
19
    consistent, I don't know of any studies that do
20
    those kinds of things outside of some legal trial
21
                This is not a burning issue in the
22
    somewhere.
    world as to whether a person's recollection of
23
24
    advertising forty years ago is exactly the same as
   what was really out there forty years ago.
```

| | Rassarjian - direct |
|----|---|
| | |
| 1 | know that there's selected perception and |
| 2 | selective perception. We don't have to prove |
| 3 | that. |
| 4 | Q. How do you know that? |
| 5 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 6 | of the question. |
| 7 | A. There have been too many studies in the |
| 8 | literature to show that. |
| 9 | Q. Selected recall with regard to |
| 10 | advertising or with information generally? |
| 11 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 12 | of the question. |
| 13 | A. All information, all perception. |
| 14 | Q. Fage 162. |
| 15 | A. I read these things and I write myself |
| 16 | little nasty notes and then later I said he is |
| 17 | "Bluffing, evidence of selective perception," but |
| 18 | who is bluffing, the questioner or the answerer. |
| 19 | I wish I would be a little more polite when I |
| 20 | write comments down. Whatever was being talked |
| 21 | about. I just thought that either the questioner |
| 22 | or the answerer was bluffing here and it was just |
| 23 | a comment to myself that they are faking each |
| 24 | other out. |

25

164

2017006804

```
Kassarjian - direct
    questioner or the respondent?
 1
 2
          No, I don't know what it was about.
 3
         ٥.
                Page 191.
          This merely says, this page is nothing
 4
    except this was the beginning of a new day of
 5
    deposition and so I left this page in there just
 6
    to key me off that this was now nine o'clock in
 7
    the morning and not five o'clock at night.
9
          Q.
                Next page, 192.
          The comment is, "People hold a particular
10
    view about pot. No advertising." The only point
11
    I'm trying to make here is that Joel somewhere
12
    said that the view people have about digarettes
13
    comes from advertising, that that's the prime
14
    cause of their view about cigarettes. And I just
15
    thought of an exception, that people have views
16
    about marijuana and there's no advertising at all,
17
18
    that giving advertising all that credit is too
    much.
19
                Page 228.
20
          Q.
          Comment, "Possibly had some
21
    effect -- considerable rather strong. We don't
22
           Simply DK," which stands for don't know,
23
    "Simply don't know." The statement is, "I think
24
    to a considerable degree". -- let me start
25
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
165
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
    again. "As one example, the growing acceptibility
 2
    of smoking by women is, I think, to a considerable
    degree due to the advertising effort directed
 3
    toward making the product more acceptable for
 5
    women." My comment was maybe, just maybe it has a
    small effect but to call it a considerable degree
 7
    is such too strong.
                         We don't know.
    simply don't know. However, my own belief is that
 8
    it is just a small part of the times and the era.
 9
                What research do you base your own
10
    belief on, sir?
11
          I actually don't need to.
12
                                      It's 25 years of
    research is your answer but I don't need to do
13
14
    that because on page 229, Cohen starts a long
15
    discussion about all of the various factors that,
    go into people smoking, not smoking, people having
16
    beliefs and so on. I did not write these down.
17
    What I did was I wrote down the page numbers that
18
    he talks about each of the various important
19
20
    factors that go into smoking, information
    environment and so on. So on page 230, he talks
21
    about psychosocial factors. 231 he talks about
22
    physiological responses and physiological
23
    responses to habit and nicotine and so on, I
```

guess. Page 234, he talks about the social

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

Kassarjian - direct pressures towards smoking in the information 234, he also talks about the impact 3 of the simple information environment. talks about reference groups and the impact that reference groups have on an individual's belief 5 system and his behavior. 235 he talks about the 7 importance of face-to-face peer groups and their impact on smoking, consumer behavior. 235 again he talks about personality and motivation and 235 he talks about communication and so what he has 10 11 done here is presented a little simple model of all of the things that go into this information 12 environment. You'll notice that communication is 13 14 just one small part of that and one small part of communication is advertising so that is the answer 15 to your question. I agree with Joel and it also 16 answers whatever your question was. 17 18

Page 242.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The comment is "Exaggeration" underlined and then the words "may have." The comment, "Social sciences that leads to the inescapable conclusion that advertising is likely to have a significant impact on people's behavior, particularly advertising of the magnitude represented in the cigarette marketing and advertising," I think

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
167
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
    that's an exaggeration.
                             Inescapable conclusion?
    Whew. Had he said cigarette leads to the
    inescapable conclusion that cigarette advertising
    may have -- he uses strong words but this is one
    smart fellow. I love the guy. He says is likely
    to have. Better yet he had said may have, he
 7
    would have been cleaner.
                You would have agreed with the
    statement if it was may have?
                MR. PARRISH: Objection to the form of
10
11
    the question.
12
          Inescapable conclusion that it may have?
    How can you disagree with inescapably may have?
13
    Do you see what it's saying? It's cancelling each
    other out.
15
16
                Would you agree that that cigarette
    advertising may have had a significant impact on
17
18
    people's behavior?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
19
20
    of the question.
          I can't disagree. It may have had.
21
    not have had. That's what you've asked and I'm
22
    saying I didn't, it may or hay not have had.
23
                How do we determine whether or not it
24
```

may or may not have had an effect on people's

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

2.5

```
Kassarjian - direct
    behavior?
 1
 2
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                               Objection to the form
    of the question.
 3
 4
          My opinion is that if it has had any effect
 5
    at all, it's a very small vector into the actual
    affect. There are many things that go into the
 6
    affect, just as Joel said three pages before. One
 7
    of these is communication and a small part of
    communication is advertising.
                                    That I'll agree
10
    to. How we convert that to the sentence may or
    may not have had effects, do what you want with
11
12
    it.
13
                Can these various elements or these
    various vectors have different degrees of effect
    on different consumers?
15
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Objection to the form
16
17
    of the question.
18
          Possibly.
                How do you know whether or not one of
19
    these vectors has more effect and more effect on
20
    one consumer as opposed to another consumer?
21
                MR. PARRISE:
                               Object to the form of
22
23
    the question.
          Consumer behavior does not study the
24
```

individual consumer. What we talk about is groups

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    of consumers.
                   We are interested in mass
 1
               These differences between individuals
 2
    and there are differences, individual differences,
 3
    almost off of our research relegates to the jargon
    word called error term. You try to reduce that
 5
    error term statistically and when you are testing
    significance, you try to wash it out so we are not
 7
    really interested particularly in the individual
 8
    consumer but in classes of consumers and typically
 9
    in the field, the individual differences are
10
    relegated to error term.
11
                There's a comment on the top of page
12
          Q.
    243.
13
          That follows what we were just talking
14
            The statement is, "But so do other
1.5
    about.
              Advertising is likely to have a
    people."
16
    significant impact on people's behavior is Joel's
17
    connent and my connent to that is but other people
18
    also have a significant impact on people's
19
               That's all.
20
    behavior.
                Continue with your comments.
21
          Then I have written, "Brand switching is
22
```

critical." What Joel has said here is that it's

preposterous to believe that digarette companies

would spend up to \$2 billion on advertising if

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

23

24

25

U17836810

```
1
    they expected it not to have an impact on people's
 2
    smoking behavior. That is truly a preposterous
 3
    idea, Joel Cohen says.
                I think he missed the point.
                                               Almost
 5
    all of this $2 billion in advertising is to get
    consumers who are smoking to switch. I don't have
 7
    the actual figures but I know that if you can get,
    especially at that time, change, consumer
    preferences and market share by one percent, every
10
    one percent change in market share of a company
    could mean millions and millions of dollars of
11
12
    profit and so for a company to spend millions to
    get brand share switching, brand switching, just
13
    one percent, two percent would mean millions of
    dollars of profits after that advertising cost so
15
    this enormous advertising that was done at the
16
    time was primarily aimed at brand switching.
17
18
                Now, some of it may have acted to
    perhaps bring a few people into the market. That
19
   isn't the point I'm getting at. The point is that
20
   the reason they spent the $2 billion wasn't to
21
   suck new people into the market. That would have
22
   been a waste of money. The purpose of it was to
23
    switch brand shares by one, two, three percent
   because millions were involved.
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

```
171
     Kassarjian - direct
                 What facts do you base your statement
  1
     on that the purpose of these $2 billion in
  2
     advertising was for brand switching?
  3
                 MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
     the question.
  5
           That's my belief of what that advertising is
 7
     about.
                 What do you base that on?
           25 years of experience in the field.
  9
                 What facts?
 10
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 11
     of the question.
 12
                 Facts, not your experience.
 13
     facts?
 14
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 15
     of the question.
 16
 17
                 Concrete facts.
           I have no concrete study if that's what you
 18
 19
     are asking.
                 Concrete facts, 'did you read a
 20
     document that said that?
 21
           No. I did not.
. 22
                 Let's go down the page.
 23
          The next word is "Okay." I'm agreeing with
 24
```

The statement is that, "Cigarette

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

something.

. 25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    companies have engaged in a direct attempt to
 1
    construct brands that would be responsive to the
    needs and wants of females." Fine.
                                        Okay, Marlboro
 3
    came out as a female cigarette, Eve as a female
 5
    cicarette.
                There's one other one, "You've come a
    long way, Baby."
                     I've often wondered what a
 7
    female and a male cigarette is but okay so I'm
               Advertising people have segmented the
    agreeing.
             So some go after the machos, some go
 9
    after the sweet, delicate women and others go
10
    after people who prefer to walk a mile.
11
                The comments on the bottom, sir?
12
           "Not so sure here."
                               My handwriting is,
13
    "Not so sure here. True for brand switching."
14
15
    Now, what does it say.
                            (Examining document.)
    What he is saying is that digarette companies
16
17
    develop cigarettes to appeal to the feminine
    market and to make it appear much more socially
18
    acceptable and attractive for women to smoke and
19
    I'm saying you've overstepped the bounds again.
20
21
    don't know if digarette smoking can make anything
    appear more attractive or whatever.
22
                Fage 250 is the next page.
23
           "Exaggeration." The statement is
24
```

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9668

"... without any question that digarette

Kassarjian - direct

advertising is highly likely to create change in a

person's beliefs and attitudes likely to be of

significant effect on people's purchasing

behavior. T'm sorry, Joel, I cannot agree with

you on this.

Q. Page 276.

A. Bottom of the page I've written, "Also that product is risky." The question, I don't know what the question was. The answer was, Joel stated, "One of the things that advertising and marketing of very low tar filter cigarettes may have done is to communicate, at least indirectly, that there is a safe level of smoking."

My comment to that is what those kind of advertising have done is to remind people that the product is risky. This is what I would like to call self-destruct type advertising, where you tell people our product is not as bad as our competitor's product. What that is really saying is we are all pretty bad but ours is not as bad and where Joel feels that, he feels that low tar filter cigarette advertising is to communicate a safe level, my feeling on this is that what those ads were communicating is there's a safe level necessarily but that the dam product is

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

dangerous.

2

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. What did you base that on? Did you conduct any surveys?
- 4 A. I'm basing it on exactly what Joel Cohen
 5 based it on in his statement, which is his 25
 6 years of experience in the field. We are both
 7 basing it on the same data.
 - Q. Page 278.
- 9 A. "Reminds people it is dangerous." This
 10 continues along with the previous comment that the
 11 advertising of these low tar cigarettes and
 12 mentioning of the tar and nicotine content of
 13 cigarettes just keeps reminding people this is a
 14 dangerous product. I think that those ads have
 15 that very specific message in them that the
 16 product is dangerous.
 - that of any significance?

 A. Almost always means I couldn't understand
 the long paragraph that Joel talks in. No, I just
 went very slowly and tried to understand what the
 statement was.

There's underlining on this page.

- Q. Page 279.
- 24 A. My statement is, "Too specific. Not how 25 average consumer behaves." I'm reacting to, "What

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    I guess is called a dose-response function,
 1
 2
    meaning the relationship between the amount of
    cigarettes smoked and the likelihood of particular
 3
    problems arising.
                       That would help her and people
    like her decide on the degree of risk they were
 5
    subjecting themselves to by a particular amount of
 7
    smoking."
                If I understand this, if I remember it
 8
    correctly, Joel is asking for more information on
 9
10
    how serious and what health risks there are
11
    related to the amount you smoke, so if you smoke
    only three or four cigarettes a day, how terrible
12
    is that. He is asking for that kind of
13
14
    information because then the consumer could take
15
    the risks and could take the negative parts of .
    smoking, the risks, and the positive parts of
    smoking, the high you get or whatever people who
17
    smoke say they got and balance them and come to a
18
    conclusion and my feeling is that Mrs. Cohen or
19
    other people do not make these kind of decisions.
20
21
    I know Joan fairly well, quite well, and she
22
    snokes cigarettes once in a while and she doesn't
    go around saying negative 16 points, positive 15
23
```

points, therefore, I

shall . . . We don't do that.

24

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- Q. Page 284.
- 2 A. My comment, the question, "too specific.
- 3 Talk molar but answer molecular." That's all
- 4 | jargon, folks. That's all plain undiluted argot
- 5 and jargon. Holar is a technical term meaning the
- 6 big picture, the molar view of things. Molecular
- 7 is jargon meaning the tiny, teeny weeny picture.
- 8 What I'm saying here is that Joel is being much
- 9 too specific. I know what he believes about these
- 10 kinds of things and he talks about these molar big
- 11 pictures and narrows it down to a tiny little
- 12 thing and focuses in on that and that's all I mean
- 13 | there.

1

- 14 Q. You don't think that that can be done
- 15 | in the area of consumer behavior?
- 16 A. You can do your processing, your analysis at
- 17 the molar level or at the molecular level. You
- 18 prefer the molar although some answers come from
- 19 the teensy weensy atomistic level.
- 20 Q. Why do you say it's too specific, sir?
- 21 A. I don't know. Wait a minute. Let me read
- 22 this. (Examining document.) I'm having a
- 23 terrible time understanding what this page says.
- 24 It's these long convoluted sentences and I don't
- 25 know what what I was thinking about. I haven'

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters .

```
Kassarjian - direct
    got the vaguest idea of what the page said.
 1
                Page 288?
 2
          Question mark arrow, "Is there a survey?
 3
    I'm not well informed," arrow, "Narrow answer to
    Cohen." Let's see.
                         (Examining document.)
    Apparently there was about four or five pages of
    argument between Mr. Edell and Mr. Bleakley which
 7
    I just threw out because I wasn't about to carry
         I lost the guestion.
                               I simply don't know
 9
    what the question is now.
                               That was several pages
10
    before and like a jerk, I threw it out but the
11
    answer is, "Let me illustrate the point." Somehow
12
13
   he is talking about a survey or doing a survey and
    asking people if it's hazardous to their health
    and I was asking myself is there such a survey, I
15
    don't know anything about it, I'm not well
16
17
    informed of these kinds of surveys and that's in
    there so I'm asking myself a question is there a
10
    survey or is it a narrow answer that Cohen is
19
    trying to give about something that he knows or is
20
21
    it a broader question but other than that, I don't
22
    know.
                What surveys are you not well informed
23
          ٥.
    of, sir?
24
25
                MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 | the question.
- 2 A. Let me illustrate the point. I think if you
- 3 carry out a survey and you ask people is smoking
- 4 hazardous to your health or you ask people does
- 5 cigarette smoking cause cancer and then it
- 6 continues, I don't know if this is a hypothetical
- 7 answer or whether he is talking about a survey
- 8 that really exists and that's what my comment is.
- 9 Is there such a survey, is it a real thing you're
- 10 talking about or is it hypothetical like you are
- 11 making it sound. That's what that comment on the
- 12 page is about.
- Q. You don't know of any such survey. Is
- 14 | that what you are saying?
- 15 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 16 of the question.
- 17 A. I don't know of any such survey.
- 18 Q. Now you know why we have four pages of
- 19 colloguy. Page 290.
- 20 A. I don't know what that is but I do remember
- 21 | that somewhere in the Cohen thing, you are not
- 22 supposed to do that.
- 23 Q. Colloguy? You are right. Page 290
- 24 | A. My counent, "Smoker do not do this type of
- 25 analysis. Only information processing researchers

```
Kassarjian - direct
    do such things."
                      Answer: "My testimony is that
 2
    people think about positive and negative reasons
 3
    for engaging in a behavior as one of the things
    they do in leading up to the act of continuing or
    ceasing a behavior. To the extent that people
    have a better understanding of not only potential
 7
    and, hence, not necessarily immediate or
    personally relevant outcomes but of more immediate
    effects, you increase the likelihood that they
 9
10
    would make a decision either not to start smoking
    in the first place or to discontinue smoking."
11
          What Joel is saying here is that if people
12
13
    have enough information, they will do an analysis,
    I don't know what it's called, a cost benefit
14
15
    analysis, a positive-negative analysis or
16
    something and make a decision if they have enough
17
                  I'm saying the average consumer does
    information.
18
    not behave that way.
                          I appreciate that
19
    information processing models claim they behave
    that way but I claim they do not.
20
                                      People make
                Period.
                         Do it and then find the
21
    decisions.
```

Q. How do they make decisions?

A. They make them.

reason why.

22

23

24

25

Q. Based on what?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

car that way.

1 MR._BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 2 of the question.

- A. Based on whatever they've got. People do not sit down. I'm willing to bet that you do not sit down, even when you buy a major thing like a car, and make a big long list that says good things about the Ford, bad things about the Ford. I'm willing to bet that you don't say this is worth three points and this is worth four points and I totaled it up and get 82 here and 78 here and you go out and buy this car because it's a four-point difference. I don't believe you buy a
- Q. I understand that. But let me ask you this. Do you think that people make a decision 'looking at some of the pros and some of the cons of that decision?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

- A. They make decisions. Some make them one way, some make them another way but they make decisions. All we know is that they do not go through this kind of analysis.
- g. You mean actually put it down on a piece of paper or going through the pros and cons

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 in their mind?
- 2 A. I don't care whether they write it down or
- 3 not. That's not the important point. The
- 4 important point is, positive and negative reasons
- 5 for engaging in a behavior, I don't think that a
- 6 person sits down who doesn't smoke and decides on
- 7 all positive and negative reasons to start smoking
- 8 and smokes. I don't believe a person sits down
- 9 who is a smoker and says on the next digarette,
- 10 let's see now, shall I smoke this digarette, let
- 11 | me think of all the positive reasons and let me
- 12 think of all the negative reasons and then based
- on those numbers, lights the cigarette or doesn't.
- 14 g. What do they take into consideration?
- 15 MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
- 16 the question.
- 17 A. Whatever but they don't go through that
- 18 | analysis.
- 19 Q. How do you know that?
- 20 A. Based on my 25 years of experience in the
- 21 field.
- 22 Q. You don't know what process they go
- 23 through but you are sure that they don't go
- 24 through a process of weighing the pros and the
- 25 | cons. Is that right?

```
MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
1
2
   of the question.
```

13

14

22

23

24

25

Can you tell me an instance, except maybe 3 the purchase of a home, where you did that? you do that when you think about crossing a I wonder if I should cross. The pro is I 7 want to get across the street but the con is that I could get killed by a taxicab. That's not But if I get hit by the taxicab, I might sue and make a mint but I might break a leg but 10 11 that isn't nice; therefore, I shall cross. You cross the street.

every decision. 15 For which decisions does one go through a weighing of the pros and the cons? 16

You don't go through this process on

17 MR: BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 18 of the question.

Maybe none. If any at all, only very major 19 decisions like switching a job to another city, 20 21 buying a big home, something very important and

very major.

Are your thoughts on the subject Q. accepted by other colleagues in your field? MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

C28933.110

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|-----|--|
| 1 | of the question. |
| 2 | A. I believe so. |
| 3 | Q. By whom? |
| 4 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 5 | of the question. |
| 6 | A. Sy whom? |
| 7 | Q. Yes. Are there colleagues in the |
| 8 | field of consumer behavior who have written on |
| 9 | this subject in which they agree with your |
| 10 | comments? |
| 11 | A. I would suggest you take a look at any of |
| 1 2 | the textbooks and then try to decide whether I'm |
| 13 | out in left field or not. |
| 1 4 | Q. Direct me to one textbook that would |
| 15 | substantiate what you just said. |
| 16 | A. No. I will direct you to textbooks that |
| 17 | will talk about consumer behavior but I doubt if |
| 18 | there's a single textbook that talks about the |
| 19 | decision-making process in crossing the street. |
| 20 | Q. The decision-making process period, |
| 21 | sir. You are the one that used the example of |
| 22 | crossing the street, not me. |
| 23 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form |
| 2 4 | of the question. |
| 25 | A. Almost any textbook will have that kind of |

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Kassarjian - direct

1 information. You want me to list a few?

2 Q. Yes.

3 A. William Wilke called Consumer Behavior.

Q. Is that a good book?

5 A. Good book.

Q. Any other books?

7 A. Thomas Robertson entitled Consumer Behavior,

8 good book.

4

6

9

Q. Page 301.

10 A. My comment, "Giving impression there is a

11 logical decision here. Do not behave like a

12 computer. Make decisions period - on next

13 cigarette - until time to quit when the negatives

14 outdo the positives." It's exactly the same

15 comments, exactly the same topic. We are talking

16 about how people make decisions, whether they

17 behave like computer and I'm saying they do not.

18 They make the decision and then if you push them

19 for reasons, they concoct reasons or give you

20 reasons but the decision is made. It's a gestalt

21 decision that's made at once.

22 g. When you say a gestalt decision, what

23 do you mean?

24 | A. All the little vectors coming into it and

25 | mixing them up and that's what causes the

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666 2017006824

```
Kassarjian - direct
    decision.
 2
                When you say all the vectors, you are
    talking about all the information that a person is
    exposed to. Correct?
          Not exposed to. All the information they
    choose to use or not use.
 7
                How do you know what information a
    consumer chooses to use or not use?
 A
 9
          That's an individual decision. How do we
10
    know? That's a research study I suppose that one
    could concoct.
11
12
          Ω.
                Have you ever done such research?
13
          No.
14
                Has anyone?
15
          I don't know.
```

A. Foor Joel. He has gotten trapped into claiming he could predict the behavior of a single individual and my comment is that, "In general," you might be able to explain why people behave as they do, "but you can't ever do that for the specific person. That's all.

Q. Page 313.

Page 310.

A. My words on top, "Don't and can't," whatever that is. Later I say, "Exaggeration, don't think

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| | } |
|---|---|
| | the tools for a specific person, don't know all |
| 2 | the available vectors." It's the same comment. |
| 1 | The issue is whether our science is so advanced |
| | that we can predict what a single individual is |
| 5 | going to do and I just feel that no, we cannot, w |
| 5 | do not and that this was a bit of a exaggeration, |
| , | kind of an advocacy exaggeration. |

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

. 22

Q. As opposed to predicting what a consumer will do in the future, is your research in consumer behavior such that you can, by looking back at a person's life, draw conclusions as to what they would have done?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

A. Not for the single individual. We can talk, after the behavior, the act happened, then we try to talk about why people in general might behave that way but I think that any time you talk about the single individual, you get into trouble.

Can I give an example? Suppose we are looking at the behavior of individuals leaving a football game. The football game just ends. We are in a helicopter watching. We predict that everyone will walk away from the arena toward the parking lot and sure enough, we photograph and

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 more likely than not, overwhelming numbers of
2 people are walking to the parking lot. Theories
3 are proven. After games, people go to parking
4 lot.

there's occasionally a person who, rather than walking from the arena to the parking lot, is walking from the parking lot to the arena. There's no way we can predict that unless we knew everything. They may have forgotten their unbrella, they may have gotten the day wrong and they think there's some other game that's going to go on the next time. They may be so damn drunk they don't know what direction they are going. We don't know.

Unless you take that individual and subject him to the most thorough examination, which we just can't do, we don't have the tools to do it, we can't make a prediction on the individual. We can talk until we are blue in the face that people will leave the arena and go to the car but we can't predict on the person who will go the other way.

Q. We can try to assess the probability that a person will walk to the parking lot, can't

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
188
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
 2
                    BLEAKLEY:
                               Objection to the form
 3
    of the question.
          When you talk about probabilities, you are
    not talking about the probability of a single
    individual. You have to be careful.
    probability data comes from the aggregate.
 7
                I understand that. Can you establish
 8
    the probability that an individual will walk to
10
    the parking lot after the game?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
11
   of the question.
12
          Can I actually put a number on it? Is that
13
14
   what you are Laking?
                Probability, more probably than not
15
    the person will walk to the parking lot. Can you
16
   draw that conclusion from the example that you
17
   gave us?
18
          I would make a prediction that people should
19
   be walking to the parking lot, yes.
                And more likely than that --
21
          I don't want to use the words. Does that
22
   mean 51 percent or does it mean $2 percent?
23
                51 percent, more probably than not.
24
```

I won't draw that conclusion. If you want

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
   to say will most likely walk, I'll accept it.
    minute you talk about numbers like 51 percent or
    17 percent, why is it 51 and not 32 percent or 97
    percent?
               . You are willing to say that most
    likely someone leaving the game will walk to the
    parking lot, however. Correct?
 7
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
 8
    of the question.
 9
          Yes.
10
                What do you base that on?
11
          25 years of experience in the field.
                                                 Also
12
    there's a lot of literature on this by the way.
13
                What literature is that, sir?
14
          Just a whole lot of literature in the
15
    modeling literature, stochastic modeling of
    aggregate behavior. We are talking aggregate
17
                   The whole area of mathematical
    behavior now.
18
    models in consumer behavior is in this ballpark.
19
                314.
20
          My comment, "Don't know how can be done for
21
    single individual. Perhaps clinical psychology
22
    can make a hypothesis but that is all." Later I
23
    say, "No way to measure extent of influence.
24
    Total information environment, totality of facts
```

25

```
190
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
    has affect.
                 What part is advertising and
 2
    promotion.
                Not measurable. [Examining
 3
    document.)
                What Joel is saying is that the
    principles used to evaluate the impact of
    advertising on aggregates, on bunches of people
    can be used to evaluate the impact of advertising
 7
    on any given person.
 a
                You disagree with that?
 9
          I disagree with that.
10
                Is there any literature that supports
    that statement?
11
12
          I have as much literature that supports that
13
    statement as Joel has that supports the opposite
14
                Neither of us have any in other words.
                Let's continue with the comments.
15
          What I'm saying here is that maybe, just
16
    maybe an individual trained in clinical psychology
17
18
    who tests the patient on the couch and goes
19
    through some kind of an analysis here can make
20
    some hypotheses. Not facts but some hypotheses,
21
    assumptions, statements about how a single
    individual might react, Naybe he can make
22
    hypotheses but in consumer behavior with the tools
23
    we've got, I don't believe that's possible.
24
25
    think there's no way to measure the extent of
```

Kassarjian - direct influence that advertising has on a single 1 individual. We don't do that. We never do that. 2 When we talk of effects of advertising, we are not 3 talking about effects of advertising on Mrs. We are talking of about effects of 5 advertising on women, on yuppies but never Mrs. Jones. That's all. 7 Page 316. 8 My comment, "Cannot know specific body. 9 Only rough approximation of what was available, 10 ec., Pollay study. DK," that is, don't know, 11 "what she read or was exposed to. Perhaps only 12 movie glamour magazines." 13 (Examining document.) Now let's see. Poor Joel, he makes the claim in here that he 15 knows what specific body of advertising Mrs. 16 Cipollone was exposed to and he knows because she 17 says so somewhere so somebody told him and makes 18 statements that he knew what specific body of 19 advertising she was exposed to 45 years earlier or 20 whatever earlier and I feel there's no way of 21

knowing that. There's no way that Mrs. Cipollone

could have known what she was exposed to or could

possibly remember 45 years ago. I think even very

drastic techniques, interviewing techniques would

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

22

23

24

25.

1 not be able to draw that out. There is no way of 2 knowing what she was exposed to at the time.

- Q. Even in a hostile deposition
- proceeding?

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 A. Even that. I was thinking more and then I figured don't open that can of worms of drug interviewing with --

MR. BLEAKLEY: McDonald's worms?
THE WITNESS: Yes.

- Q. Page 317.
- A. Especially by the way hostile deposition proceedings. "Doubt that she can remember.

 (Perhaps prompted) This is questionable." Rose Cipollone, according to this deposition, I got the impression Rose Cipollone showed some ads or was shown some ads and she said she remembered seeing those ads and then Joel Cohen said having seen those ads, da da da da da.

What I'm saying is I have a great deal of difficulty believing that any individual can remember the totality of the ads they were exposed to 45 years earlier or 40 years earlier or 20 years earlier. She may remember an occasional ad. More likely she was shown some ads and then was told she remembered them or thought she

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
193
    Kassarjian - direct
    remembered them and then that became fact.
 1
 2
    myself deep in my gut I believe I remember seeing
    the original Ronald Reagan ad pushing Chesterfield
 3
    cigarettes I think it was but I don't know if I
    really saw it or I've seen it since several times
    and think I saw it. A person cannot give that
 7
    kind of a sure statement of what they did dozens
    of years earlier.
 8
                Is it your testimony that Rose
 9
10
    Cipollone could not accurately state that she saw
    an ad twenty years ago or thirty years ago?
11
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
12
13
    of the question.
          I won't argue about one ad.
14
                At what point in time would you start
15
    arguing about her ability to recall specific ads?
16
    Twenty, thirty, fifteen, five, six, one?
17
18
          24 hours.
                I'm sorry?
19
20
          24 hours.
                In other words, if she testified I
21
    recall seeing a specific ad or ten specific ads 24
22
    hours ago, you would put some credence in that?
23
```

Let me point out something.

you how many ads were you exposed to yesterday,

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9668

If I ask

```
Kassarjian - direct
  1
     yesterday, not 45 years ago, yesterday, you might
  2
     say newspapers, you listened to a bit of
  3
     television, maybe you had a radio on, you might
     say 100, 200, 300. These studies have been done.
  5
     The average individual on an average day is
     exposed to 2,000 ads. I defy you to remember more
  7
     than a hundred of those 2,000. That was
  8
     yesterday, not 45 years ago.
                 That's what I'm trying to find out.
  9
 10
     In your opinion how many ads could Rose Cipollone
     be able to identify that she saw thirty or forty
 11
     years ago?
 12
 13
                 MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                 Objection to the form
     of the question.
           I don't have any idea. She will identify
 15
                I don't even know if that
     some ads.
 16
 17
     identification is credible or not. I don't know
 18
     if she really saw them or thinks she saw them.
     feel there is no way to answer that question or to
 19
 20
     test that question of what she was exposed to 45
 21
     years ago, 20 years ago, yesterday even.
                 Do you believe that people can recall
. 22
     advertising campaigns which occurred twenty,
 23
 24
     thirty, forty years ago?
 25
           Perhaps.
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 6

25

- 1 Q. Like Winston tastes good like a
 2 cigarette should, LSMFT. You remember those,
 3 don't you?
- A. I also remember them because I use them in my class all the time, I also remember a little song for Pepsi-Cola. Do you want me to sing it to you?
 - Q. No. Those are advertising campaigns and theses. Correct, sir?
- 10 A. The reason I'm avoiding your answer is that
 11 that's a very specific word to what a campaign
 12 is. It's advertising jargon and I don't know
 13 exactly what the word campaign means but if you
 14 mean something like do you remember the jingle
 15 Winston tastes good like a cigarette should, do
 16 you remember Lucky Strike green went to war, that
 17 kind of thing --

MR. BLEAKLEY: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Boy, you are old. That was world war II ads, Lucky Strike green went to war.

- A. If you mean that, then if we can remember that kind of meaningful phrase or jingle for a long, long time and I've written to that effect.
 - g. Can people remember a series of ads

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
196
     Kassarjian - direct
  1
     with similar themes for the same product?
  2
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
     of the question.
  3
           I don't know what a series of ads are.
     they remember individualized in a bunch?
  5
                  An ad campaign which they varied the
     pictorial aspect of the advertisement only
  7
     slightly but the basic theme of the ad remained
           Possibly.
                      I suspect that people remember, I
 10
     would rather switch -- no, I got it wrong.
 11
     rather switch than fight. I'd rather fight than
 12
 13
              I did a great job of remembering it.
                 It was a little Freudian.
 14
           I would rather switch than fight.
 15
     of thing can be remembered and we can vaguely
 16
     remember that there were several ads on that same
 17
     jingle or whatever that's called but beyond that,
 18
     I don't think so. Is that what a campaign means,
 19
 20
     a whole series of ads using the same phrase?
                 I never had that such familiarity with
 21
     the advertising that you probably have. Fage 320.
. 22
           "Can't know this" and then the word
 23
     exaggeration. Joel says that it is his position
 24
```

that advertising is very important in creating a

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

Kassarjian - direct great deal of the social influence that existed at 1 2 the time which was transmitted in other ways to 3 Rose Cipollone. There's no way he can know how important advertising was a bunch of years ago in 5 creating the social influence that Rose Cipollone was exposed to, that is, the friends she had, the 7 neighbors she had. How can you probably know what 8 the influence of advertising was on that. 9 Q. Page 321. 10 "What about pot, cocaine, heroin?" 11 be saying, he is telling us how important advertising is in taking up smoking and I just 12

when there's no advertising at all.

Q. Do you think it would be more likely

if there was advertising of the volume similar to

cigarette advertising that more people would use

pot, cccaine and heroin?

commented to myself how do you explain people

smoking pot, snorting cocaine or shooting heroin

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

22 A. I have no idea.

13

14

20

21

23

Q. Could you continue with your comments?

24 A. "No advertising. Can't know that would have

25 been. Advertising may have had some effect."

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    Somebody asked poor Joel Cohen the same kind of
 1
    question you just asked me, if that and this and
 2
    this and that, then what. He said, "Is it your
 3
    opinion that it is more probably than not that
    Rose Cipollone would not have begun smoking if
    there had never been any advertising of
 7
    cigarettes?" And somebody objected to the form of
    the question and then he answered it and my
    reaction to it was that there's no way that he
    could have known that.
                            That's all.
10
                There's a question there.
                                            What does
11
12
    that mean, your handwritten note? There is a yes
13
    there, y-e-s.
14
                Right after you have the
15
16
    underlining --
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                               On 321.
17
                         Somehow I got the impression
18
          It continues.
    that if he is saying that the huge numbers of
    people she knew cut back to smoking would not have
    an impact on her, I felt yes. I felt that other
21
    people are a critical, an important factor in
              Next page I say exaggeration but I don't
    know what that was.
24
```

324.

٥.

25

- 1 A. "Gross exaggeration." These are my own
 2 words. I don't mean to impeach Cohen with any of
 3 these phrases.
 - Q. Terms of endearment.
- 5 Terms of endearment, yes. I don't know if you've talked to him but we are old friends. 7 I read what this said? It says, "Gross exaggeration. Must have knowledge of entire 8 9 gestalt, times or information environment." The 10 question was, "In your opinion are you competent to express an opinion concerning the behavior, the 11 conduct, the actions that a particular consumer is 12 going to take as a result of being exposed to 13 particular advertising," and he says yes. 14 15 you ever done that before" and he says, "As I told 16 you in response to a related question earlier, the unit of analysis and research carried out by 17 people like myself and in particular me as an 18 expert in consumer behavior is never the 19 individual from the standpoint of testing theories 20 and publishing papers in scholarly journals." 21 22 said yes, of course." I agree. That's what I've been saying. It's exactly what he says. Our 23 field is not the individual. That's the field of 24 clinical psychology.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- Q. Page 325.
- 2 A. I thought that Joel was trying to outwit the
- 3 lawyer here. Whatever it was, I just had this
- 4 kind of feeling, this bantering and each one was
- 5 playing games with the other.
 - Q. Not like this?
- 7 A. No, it wouldn't be like this at all. It's
- 8 just a comment to myself that he is trying to
- 9 outwit the lawyer. Then I said to myself that's a
- 10 mistake as if I would ever do anything like that.
- II Then later I have, "Okay, do it but reliability
- 12 and validity suffers. Small percentage of
- 13 variance can be accounted for.
- 14 Q. What are you referring to?
- 15 A. What he is saying is that in our field, we
- 16 do not study the individual but we study
- 17 aggregates, bunches. Then he is saying, however,
- 18 the same principles, in studying a bunch, can be
- 19 applied to studying the individual and, therefore,
- 20 I can make claims about individual behavior and
- 21 I'm saying go ahead, make all the claims you want
- 22 but the validity and the reliability of any claims
- 23 you make are going to suffer a great deal.
- 24 When you make claims about an
- 25 | individual, there's a large error term, that is,

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

JUL7996841

```
Kassarjian - direct
    you can only guess a little bit better than
 1
    chance. That's what I mean by only a small
    percentage.
                 Variance can be accounted for.
    can say anything you want but don't expect it to
    be reliable, valid or credible.
                331.
 7
          There's the third day.
                                   It's a note to
    myself that we are starting over again. "Pointed
    out that product not safe! Problems-did that
            I haven't got the vaguest idea what that
10
    much. "
            (Examining document.) Something about the
11
    means.
    risks of smoking and I quess I'm saying that if
12
13
    something else, the advertising pointed out
    problems but I don't know where my thoughts were
14
15
    at the time.
16
                Page 334?
17
          My comment, "True but that is not the
    goal--seems to remind consumers at point of
18
19
    consumption of health risks." His answer to a
    question was, "As I look at that warning in
    conjunction with the information available to
21
    consumers and the ambiguity of that information,
22
    my opinion is that it is not adequate to alert
23
    consumers to the nature and severity of the risks
24
    they incur in smoking digarettes."
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

If I remember correctly, this part of 1 2 the deposition is talking about the health warning that's on the digarette packages and on all 3 advertising and he is saying he does not feel that that was adequate to alert consumers that this is 5 a dangerous product. He doesn't feel that health warning was adequate and I said true, it may or may not have been adequate but that was not the What it did do in my opinion, what that health warning did do very well was remind 10 consumers at the point of consumption that there 11 is a health risk. It may not have been the best 12 possible warning but it was a good warning because 13 it reminded the consumer every time he reached for 14 15 the cigarette, every time he lit it, what stared him in the face was that this is a risky product 17 and unlike most of the FTC and Joel, I think that warning was a good warning. 18 19 You didn't write here "True"? 20 "True but that is not the goal." MR. EDELL: Would you read back his 21

Q. I thought that you added another word there when you gave us your answer.

(Answer read.)

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

answer, please.

22

23

25

1 Q. Your comment wasn't true, that may or
2 may not have been adequate. Your comment was
3 simply true. Isn't that right, sir?

4 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form 5 of the question.

- A. Those are the notes I wrote down. Are you asking me what I intended when I wrote it down or are you asking me precisely what the words were I wrote?
- 10 Q. The words that you wrote were, "True but that is not the goal" and you were referencing 12 Dr. Cohen's opinion that the warning is not 13 adequate to alert consumers as to the nature and 14 severity of the risks they incur in smoking 15 cigarettes. Correct?

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form of the question.

- A. True. All that is saying is that cigarette smoking is dangerous to your health and it isn't listing all the things that could go wrong with you. It's true that it's not listing everything. I think it's fulfilling a very important function personally but it's not listing all the possible things that could go wrong with you.
 - Q. Are you aware of anybody else who

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
204
    Kassarjian - direct
    agrees with you; sir?
 1
                                Objection to the form
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
 2
    of the question.
 3
          I would guess half the field.
                Half the field in consumer behavior?
 5
          Yes.
                Page 373.
 7
          "Harold does not have evidence," Harold, me,
    "does not have evidence." However, doesn't have
 9
               I think I've written, "Harold does not
    have evidence" and later, "No evidence for this
11
    that I have seen. " Further down, "Okay.
12
    she knew of the dangers of smoking and did not or
13
    could not stop. "
14
                What is this about? (Examining
15
    document.) Okay. Joel is saying here that Rose
16
    Cipollone was in the category of people who would
17
    be likely to switch to a safer digarette and if
18
    the Palladium cigarette in fact is a safer
19
    cigarette, then people in that category would be
20
    more likely than that to switch to it.
21
    have evidence for that claim.
                                    That's all I's
22
23
    saying.
                What did you mean by
24
```

have evidence"?

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
          I don't know. I don't know if that's
    Harold, however, or what that word is. I don't
 2
 3
    know. I can't read it. It doesn't make any
    sense.
 5
          Q.
                Your comment on the bottom of the
    page?
. 7
          "Okay." He is saying that the Palladium
 8
    cigarettes were safer and that information was
    conveyed to her and there were no other obstacles
    in her way of purchasing Palladium cigarettes that
10
    she might buy it and I said, "Okay" but it's
11
12
    important on this word more likely than not, I
   don't believe when that phrase is used it means a
13
    percentage number like 51 percent or 26 percent or
14
    39 percent. I don't believe that Cohen believes
   or intended that to mean 51 percent or 19
16
17
   percent. I think it's a turn of a phrase and so I
   want to make that very point very clear.
18
   not talking about a majority or 51 percent. I
19
   don't think he is and I know I'm not.
20
                You are talking about less than 51
21
          Q .
   percent.
              Is that correct?
22
23
          No.
                It could be more or less?
24
          It could be more or less.
25
                                    We don't know.
```

JUE 7006846

Kassarjian - direct

1 It's a turn of a phrase and it does not imply a 2 statistic.

- 3 Q. Page 378.
- 4 A. My comment, "For most products, consumer not
- 5 a computer. Makes a decision."
- 6 Q. Is it similar to your comments
- 7 previously?
- 8 A. The earlier comments.
- 9 Q. Page 402.
- 10 A. My comment, "Influence of the variables
- 11 other than advertising. This is very nice
- 12 because here I agree with Joel. He agrees with
- 13 me. On page 402, my comment states, "Influence of
- 14 the variables other than advertising. " Joel Cohen
- 15 is talking about what it would take to get a new
- 16 cigarette accepted and he talks about free
- 17 publicity on the evening news, talk shows, noise
- 18 about the product, a stampede of consumers running
- 19 out to buy the product. Under those conditions,
- 20 the product could be successful and we agree.
- 21 Advertising, too, but in addition to advertising,
- 22 it's a lot more. Advertising alone is not enough.
- 23 Q. Page 415.
- 24 A. Just a circle. I don't know. I was just
- 25 kind of assied, wondered who the hell was paying

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    the bill.
 1
                          Page. 460.
 2
                Ne, too.
                    Oh, dear. Oh, this is where he
 3
    has gotten himself out on a limb.
                                       He talks about
    a sutual colleague, Bart Weitz, and they play a
    baseball player game and he predicted that Bart
    Weitz would draft Manny Mota or something and the
    question there, the question that the lawyer
    stated was "Remarkable" and I thought boy, is that
 9
    sarcastic. Isn't it remarkable you could predict
10
    in some game. That was all. I was just -- later
11
    I say, "Yes! But that's a mouthful." He said,
12
    "You need to understand the person's needs and
13
14
    wants, something of their situation, something of
    the assortment of options presented to them." How
15
    do you predict? You need to understand all there
16
    is about a person and my comment was, "Yes, but
17
    that's a mouthful." If you know everything, you
18
19
    can predict.
                  Fine.
                Page 465.
20
          Here I say, "Okay, got off the hook."
                                                  Joel
21
    had gotten himself way out on a limb and on this
    page he wiggles right back off the limb and is
23
    back on hard ground. That's all. Page 488
```

and I have a blank page in here that

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Q.

25

```
| Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 has handwriting on it.
- 2 A. I have something on the back, "Opinion of
- 3 | Cohen and Pollay, CA, " content analysis, "Opinion
- 4 of Cohen and Pollay, content analysis cannot be
- 5 used to effect of content analysis on p-o-s-e of
- 6 consumer. "Caused" and an arrow. I don't have
- 7 | the vaguest idea what that is. It was obviously
- 8 brilliant and it's gone forever.
 - Q. Page 488.

- 10 A. "Key point, does he have enough. I DK,"
- Il that is, I don't know, "what he knows or has.
- 12 Question: "You've testified over the last few
- 13 days that you feel you know about Rose Cipollone
- 14 and that you would know enough about her to
- 15 predict her behavior. Describe for me based on
- 16 | that understanding of Rose Cipollone her
- 17 personality. From a personality standpoint, what
- 18 | kind of woman was Rose Cipollone?"
- 19 At this point I thought Joel, do you
- 20 have enough information to make that statement,
- 21 get out of that, don't answer it, I can't imagine
- 22 | you have enough information but I don't know what
- 23 you know. I don't know how much information you
- 24 have and so that's what the comment said.
- 25 Q. How much information would you need?

```
209
    Kassarjian - direct
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                               Objection to the form
 1
 2
    of the question.
          A whole lot to predict the personality of a
 3
    person, three, four years of psychoanalysis maybe.
                MR. BLEAKLEY: I need a break.
 5
                MR. EDELL: Anything to accommodate
 6
 7
    you.
                 (Short break.)
 8
                Let's start with the summer 1987
 9
    version, the revised version you have there.
10
          Revised July 1987.
11
                 (Kassarjian Exhibit 3 marked for
12
    identification.)
13
                I show you what has been marked
14
    Kassarjian Exhibit 3. That's Professor Pollay's
15
    summer 1987 content analysis. On the first page
16
    it says, "Put on stand."
17
                                      What the hell
          I was mumbling to myself.
    does a curator mean and maybe if you put him on
19
    the stand, you'll find out what a curator of
21
    history archives means.
                Have you seen his curriculum vitae,
22
23
    sir?
24
```

When were you showed his curriculum

waga and spinelli certified shorthand renorters

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052

```
210
    Kassarjian - direct
    vitae?
          About the end of July 1987.
                                        It came with
 2
 3
    the report.
                Do you have any comments with respect
 5
    to his curriculus vitae?
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Objection to the form
 7
    of the question.
          No.
               It lists his articles.
                                        That's all.
                Let's go through the content
               The first comments are on page three.
10
                I had a very, very difficult time
11
    understanding what this man did. It's just a
12
    string of numbers. As I was trying to figure out
13
    where he got these things and how many missing
14
    cells, how many missing quarters and so on, I was
15
    just mumbling trying to figure it out. Later I
16
    figured out that Cohen couldn't figure it out.
17
    Whoever commissioned it couldn't figure it out and
18
    then you made him rewrite it and there's the
19
    revised version, which is better.
20
                You say, "Not random but okay if
21
          Q.
    legitimate"?
22
                I'm not hung up on pure randomness on
23
    this kind of thing because one has to weigh out
24
    the cost of doing a perfect study versus the
25
```

```
211
     Kassarjian - direct
     quality of results that's going to come out at the
  1
     other end so it didn't -- I think there's some
  2
  3
     problems with the sampling but the fact that this
     wasn't random, which might bother other people,
     does not bother me.
           Q.
                 Page four.
           I couldn't figure out what a pile is.
  7
                         I never could figure out who
     he makes it clear.
                       That he does not make clear in
     this later report.
                         He used Canadian students,
 10
     many of them, Canadian doctoral students.
 11
     many doctoral students throughout the world are
 12
     Indian, so a goodly number of his Canadian
 13
     doctoral students are probably Indian so we have
 14
     judges that are probably Indian Indian, I mean '
 15
     East India, people from the country of India, not
 16
 17
     American Indian.
                 Are you basing the statement on
 18
           Q.
     probability?
 19
           Probability, because I don't know.
 20
     not make clear who his judges are.
 21
                 Similar to the probability that we
. 22
     discussed with regard to people leaving the arena
 23
     and going to the parking lot?
 24
```

MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    of the question:
          No, not similar to that.
                This is more precise?
 3
                                Objection to the form
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
 5
    of the question.
                Sir?
 7
          No, it's not more precise.
                Do you know whether they were Canadian
 8
    or whether they just attended school in Canada?
 9
          I have no idea who the judges are.
10
    saying is that it is not clear enough for us to
11
    find out who they are.
12
                In the left-hand column you have some
13
    notes which I can't read on the copy I've been
    furnished.
                    I didn't intend to have this --
16
    these are notes to myself intended to be read only
17
            That just kind of says fiddle.
18
                Fiddle with respect to what?
19
          All of this detail on how he got judges and
20
    how he did this and how he did that and so I just
21
    kind of got bored of reading it and said fiddle,
    you are trying to impress your client.
24
                It wasn't important?
          It wasn't to me.
25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Page five?

2 A. I was concerned on this page that the
3 doctoral students he used for judges were not
4 naive. As it turned out later with the new
5 version, I saw the instructions he gave the judges
6 which were bad news. We do not have naive
7 subjects here and that bothers me a lot.

Also all of this detailing on what kind of jobs these people had, I thought was, again I just kind of thought that this was foolishness to put this in a report and if all of these are so dann important, if this kind of thing really, really is important, then why don't you tell us the really, really important stuff on the average age of your, although he hints at it, of your subjects and whether, and the fact that the Canadian and very possibly East Indian because he is asking them to make assumptions about how the world was in different eras of time, the twenties, thirties, forties, but when you've got a 22-year old kid who was not yet born when the surgeon general's report came out who then has to worry about the moral climate of the 1920s, 40 years before he was born, I worry about that, and then if it's the goral climate of the United States,

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    which is a foreign country to a Canadian and very
 1
 2
     foreign to an East Indian, I worry about that.
 3
                 Didn't you tell us that you can do a
          ο.
    content analysis with regard to editorials back in
    the early part of the development of our country?
                 MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
 7
    the question.
          Yes, but you don't tell judges imagine that
 8
 9
    you're living in the year 1776 and judge this as
    if you were living in 1776. What you say is
10
11
    according to today's standards, what do you say
12
    and that was a mistake he made.
                                      If it's important
    to have all this detail about judges, let's talk
13
    about really what's important.
14
                                     If it isn't
    important, it isn't important.
15
                                     Then we don't need
16
    all the detail.
17
                Do you think that there was some
          ٥.
18
    cultural bias that existed in this content
19
    analysis?
20
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Objection to the form
    of the question.
21
22
          Pollay is concerned about that.
    concerned about impressing the reader about how
23
24
    closely his panel of judges imitates a jury.
```

25

is almost like a shadow jury.

40\$ Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

If that's

```
215
    Kassarjian - direct
    important, I'm not claiming it is, but if that's
 2
    important, he should be worried about the cultural
    biases which are there which he never discusses.
 3
                I'm asking you whether or not you
 5
    think there is any cultural bias in the content
    analysis that was performed here.
 7
          I don't know.
                          I don't know because I don't
    know the details of exactly how it was done.
    soon as I'm allowed to see the worksheets, the
 9
    questionnaires, the details, the statistical work
10
    product, the worksheets, then I'll be able to make
11
    some conclusions about that. I've asked for them.
12
                What will they reflect in regards to
13
14
    cultural bias?
15
          The procedures used, and from the procedures
    used, I can make assumptions about possible
16
    cultural bias.
17
18
                What presumptions can you make with
19
    recard to cultural bias?
20
          None until I see what he has done.
                If there was cultural bias, what would
21
    you expect to find?
22
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Objection to the form
23
24
    of the question.
```

I don't know.

25

1

- Q. Let's turn to page six.
- 2 A. "Probably conducted in Canada." It wasn't
- 3 even clear in this paper where this study was
- 4 conducted and so I was assuming that it was
- 5 probably conducted in Canada, which was a good
- 6 assumption as appeared later.
- 7 Q. It says, "Blacks and Jews study."
- 8 A. Just to remind me of a couple of studies
- 9 that are out there showing what you were calling
- 10 | cultural bias or interviewer bias.
- 11 Q. What studies are those?
- 12 A. I don't remember the authors. There's one
- 13 study that asked people -- there are two of
- 14 them. One of them asked blacks during World War
- 15 II, do you think it's more important to beat the'
- 16 Nazis or make democracy work at home.
- Just a few of us remember "Make
- 18 desocracy work at home was the code word for
- 19 prejudice. Today it's civil rights. In those
- 20 days it was make democracy work. So blacks were
- 21 asked whether it's more important to beat the
- · 22 Germans or make democracy work at home and they
 - 23 | used black interviewers and white interviewers on
 - 24 black respondents and the results showed, if I
 - 25 remember correctly, with black interviewers, 79

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
217
     Kassarjian - direct
     percent said it was more important to make
  1
     democracy work at home than beat the Germans.
  2
  3
     With white interviewers, 30 percent said it was
     more important to make democracy work at home than
     beat -- just flip-flop.
  5
           Q.
                 There were no interviewers,
  7
     there?
  8
                It's just an example of the kind of
     bias that goes into a study and you have judges
  9
     instead of interviewers. That's all.
 10
                                             It's not an
     important point. It wasn't intended for you.
 11
     was just intended to remind me of a study.
 12
 13
                 There's a statement, "I doubt it."
     What is that?
 14
 15
           "I doubt it in papers," meaning I doubt it
                 He claims the judges were blind to the
 16
     allegations and what it's all about and yet in his
 17
     instructions, it turns out later he told them
 18
 19
     exactly what it was about and the judges were not
 20
     blind.
                 At the time that the study was being
 21
. 22
     done, at least in the Los Angeles papers, there
     were all kinds of articles about the smoking
 23
```

lawsuits, some kind of a lawsuit in Santa Barbara

that one side or another had won and there was all

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    kinds of discussion about what the implications
 1
 2
    were so I just doubt the judges were blind.
 3
                The rest of it says, "Flaw, ages are
    young. "
             I may have discussed that before.
    talking about the ages of these judges, most of
    them being born before the surgeon general's
 7
    report.
                Where is it indicated that they were
    asked to judge the ads by attempting to evaluate
 9
    them with regard to the standards of the
10
    particular time in which the ads appeared?
11
12
          Right at this point although it's also in
                       They were cautioned as well
13
    the instructions.
14
    about not judging actions in history by today's
    regulatory, legal or noral standards because
15
    medical knowledge and laws may have changed.
16
    can you possibly judge anything except according
17
    to your present standards? How can you judge them
18
19
    by standards you don't have?
                What's this little bell curve over
20
          Q.
```

here?

A. I was trying to, using his figures, since there was no work product here, back-analyze his data and guess the average age because he wouldn't tell us, and from that I guessed it was 25, 26.

wage and spine!li certified shorthand reporters

21

- 22

23

24

25

```
219
     Kassarjian - direct
     It was just my statement to back-analyze his data.
  1
      Next page, I say, "Not the way ads are ever
  2
     read."
  3
                 How are ads read?
           Q.
  5
           He is asking them in one place, very
  6
     confusing, here he tells us he wants these people
  7
     to read ads carofully, including all the fine
     print that may well provide clarity of
     understanding but they need not hunt for hidden
     clues. Later on he says don't read the fine
 10
 11
     print, that's not the way ads are read, so I don't
     know what he did except that he contradicts
 12
     himself and I said people do not sit there and
 13
     take an ad and read all the fine print.
                                               They look
 14
 15
                 Later he says that he told them to do
     that and I don't know what he did.
                                          He contradicts
 16
     himself in the two reports.
 17
 18
           Q.
                 On page seven you have comments at the
     right-hand column that you crossed out.
 19
 20
           Yes.
                 What are those?
 21
           Q.
22
           Because last night when I got the new
     version, I had them together to see what the
 23
 24
     differences were and I was writing a comment on
```

25

the new version, I thought.

405 Northfield Avenue West Orenge, N. J. 07052 201,711,4448

It turned out I had

```
Kassarjian - direct
    written it on the old version so I quickly wrote
    it on the new version because I remembered that
 2
    this had been Keroxed and I figured if my copy
    looks any different than your copy, you will jump
    down my throat so I better get rid of it off this
    version and put it on this version and then I
    couldn't get rid of it and you caught it.
 7
                I didn't jump down your throat,
 8
 9
    though.
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                              Not yet anyway.
10
          So that's what that is.
11
12
                Turn to page eight.
                    Just blah. Nothing, page nine,
13
          Nothing.
14
    there's nothing.
                What does the 85 percent mean, sir?
15
          He is talking about his reliability figures
16
    of 80 percent or higher and I just thought to
17
    myself the demo better be better than 85 percent.
18
    His data is better than 85 percent.
19
                Then there's a comment, "No!
20
    logic."
21
          That's just a dumb statement here. "In these
22
    files, any inter-judge differences, whether due to
23
    coding errors or true (and hence to be tolerated)
24
    differences." What he is saying is there are two
25
```

waga and spinelli

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052

```
221
     Kassarjian - direct
     kind of error, bad ones and the kind you can
  1
     tolerate, and I thought come on, error is error,
  3
     what do you mean by tolerate some and tolerate
              Cut the bullshit is what I was saying.
  5
                 Page ten.
           I couldn't figure out what his brackets
  6
  7
             I couldn't understand his writing style.
     In the new version, I figured it out.
                                             Here I say,
     "det all the data worksheets, et cetera."
 10
     are important. Because in any kind of scientific
     research, one must save your material so that it
 11
     can be looked over by other people. Otherwise
 12
     it's not just, not good science so I want to get
     those.
 14
                 You've done a number of content
 15
     analyses, have you not?
 16
 17
           Yes.
                 Have you ever done a content analysis
 18
 19
     of information that appeared some number of years
 20
     ago?
           Surely.
 21
     A.
. 22
                 What instructions did you give the
     judges who performed the content analysis?
 23
           One of them concerned blacks and I have to
 24
```

define what a black was and one of the questions

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    was is there a black in this picture, what is the
 1
 2
    sex, by male I mean wearing pants and looking
    masculine, by female I mean maybe wearing a dress
 3
    but maybe long hair but looking feminine, perhaps
    having breasts, that type of thing, trying to
    define what female is in an ad, what their age is
 7
    and gave some ranges and then wanted to know what
    their occupation was and gave some choices and so
    on. Normal stuff. I didn't ask them to imagine
    what they thought blacks were in 1946.
10
    them to talk about what blacks are.
11
12
    I mean by black, today's definition.
13
    these people, of course, he can do whatever he
    wants. But he is asking people to not use
14
    standards of today but to use standards as they
15
    were 60 years ago of people who are only 25 years
16
17
    old.
                Does he say that?
18
19
          Yes.
20
                Where does he say that?
21
          I read it to you.
22
                I know but I didn't see "use the
    standards of forty years ago."
23
          He says they were cautioned about not
24
    judging actions in history by today's regulatory,
25
```

waga and spinelli

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052

```
223
     Kassarjian - direct
                                 That's the way I
  1
     legal or moral standards.
  2
     interpreted that statement.
                 Where is there a reference to the ads,
  3
     as to how they should judge the ads?
           That's what we are talking about.
  5
                 I must have missed it. What page are
  7
     we talking about?
           Page six. Also in his instructions to the
     judges.
  9
                 I thought it was talking about actions
 10
           Q.
     as opposed to the ads.
 11
           They have been giving instructions to judge
 12
     ads, not to judge actions. All they've got is
 13
 14
     ads.
                 Page 12.
 15
           Q.
           Just mumbling to myself trying to make sense
 16
     of what the hell he did, trying to figure it out.
 17
                 Did you figure it out?
 18
           Well, because I had the new one, I was able
 19
     to do much better.
 20
 21
                 How was the intrajudge reliability?
           Interjudge reliability is fine. Intrajuige
. 22
     reliability is a little bit strange. Not that the
```

numbers are bad. The numbers are good but that

intrajudge reliability is kind of a relatively new

24

```
Kassarjian - direct
                             He gives the
    idea he has brought in.
    impression -- am I supposed to shut up or go on?
 3
    Do you want details on this stuff?
          ٥.
                Please.
          He has 17 judges. Then he talks about these
 5
    judges ranged in age from such and such to such
 7
    and such and they had these occupations, giving
    impression to you that there's this wide spread of
    people, that it's a representative sample of
    people, but each ad was only seen by two judges.
11
    Every ad was only seen by two judges. He doesn't
    tell us who these two judges are. For example, we
12
    don't know that the people who called product
13
    glamour, luxury, only 2 people saw those ads, not
14
    17, 2. They may have been 48 years old; they may
    have been East Indian. We know nothing about
    them. It doesn't give us data. That's why I
17
18
    wanted to see the work product.
19
                How many judges should he have used?
    Is two not enough?
20
          There's nothing wrong with two.
21
                                           I would
   have done it slightly differently. I would have
   had all judges rate across categories. He had
23
   only two judges per category but I think the two
    judges per ad is fine.
                            I'm not objecting to
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 that. It's just different than I would have done
- 2 it. That's all.

3

- Q. Page 13.
- 4 A. These things on the side are merely
- 5 repeating what's across the top because he has
- 6 this funny way of laying things out. 1938 to 1942
- 7 I kind of decided was before World War II type of
- 8 advertising. 1943 to 1947 was after the war, 1948
- 9 to 1953, smoking, whatever I was thinking of,
- 10 | something about smoking, 1954 to 1959 a lot of
- 11 studies were being done. The surgeon general came
- 12 out in '64, 1965. I don't remember what R meant
- 13 in 1966. Stronger H in '70. It must mean
- 14 health. There was a period here where I've called
- 15 and maybe other people have called the
- 16 self-destruct era where cigarette advertising did
- 17 nothing but tell you how horrible the product was
- 18 but giving all these health claims in it and maybe
- 19 that's what I meant, these self-destruct health
- 20 ads. That's all.
- 21 Q. At the bottom it says negative. What
- 22 is that?
- 23 A. "Negative N plus health." He did a funny
- 24 thing. When he is talking about health ads, he
- 25 has defined two kinds of health ads. He has

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    combined those kinds of ads that might imply smoke
    our brand and you will become macho, sexy, healthy
    and wealthy. You know, if you smoke our
    cigarettes, wonderful, it's better than vitamin
    pills. He is combining the kind of ad which is
    very negative, which says digarette smoking is bad
    for you but if you must smoke, smoke our brand
    rather than the competitor's brand, with needed
    money. Anything that had anything to do with
    health he is combining but health, there's two
    things. I would have divided these ads that imply
11
    healthy condition if you smoke versus those ads
12
    that imply you are going to drop dead, baby, if
13
14
    you sacke and he is combining them together and
    calling them health ads.
15
                You think that's incorrect?
16
17
          I would have separated them. . I would like
    to see what the differences are.
19
                It is your opinion that that is a
    serious flaw in this content analysis?
          It depends on how that's to be interpreted.
21
```

has interpreted Professor Pollay's data?

Do you know whether or not Dr. Cohen

Pollay does not interpret his data.

waga and spinelli cartified shorthand reporters

an interpretation.

23

405 North/Isid Avenue West Orange, N. J. 0705Z 203-733-9888

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 A. I don't remember enough on that because -- 1
- 2 had seen the study. I was watching for it and
- 3 | unless I'm wrong, Cohen merely says it's one of
- 4 the things he read and does not interpret it.
- 5 They are throwing the data out and not
- 6 interpreting it and as long as they don't
- 7 interpret it, it doesn't matter. So they are
- 8 combining them. No harm in combining them. The
- 9 harm is in what interpretation you give that.
- 10 This is just a cross-correlation. Table 3 is
- 11 nothing.
- 12 Q. Do you find any fault in the
- 13 categories in which Dr. Pollay grouped these ads?
- 14 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
- 15 | the question.
- 16 A. I don't know if I would have done the same
- 17 or not. I don't know.
- 18 Q. Page 15.
- 19 A. At this point, I didn't know yet whether he
- 20 was going to interpret his results particularly or
- 21 what was coming of it and in the '72 to '83 era, I
- 22 | put in "negative health claims." It appears as
- 23 if, Pollay doesn't do this, but you look at these
- 24 | figures and it appears as if the number of health
- 25 claims are increasing between '70 and '83. Se

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- how the numbers are getting bigger?
- 2 . Q. Yes.
- 3 A. The problem is if you think about the ads
- 4 | that were running at those times, these were all
- 5 | negative ads. These were all ads that said our
- 6 crappy product is better than their crappy product
- 7 because we are lower tar, use ours. That's
- 8 basically the image these digarette ads was
- 9 giving. It was these self-destruct ads.
- 10 Q. What ads?
- 11 A. The cigarette ads at the time.
- 12 Q. Did you see the ads?
- 13 A. No. I can remember the ads of the
- 14 seventies.
- 15 Q. Tell me the specific ads. What
- 16 brands?
- 17 A. Lower in tar and nicotine, smoke Carlton,
- 18 and then a list of brands A, C, D and there's an
- 19 ad for you.
- 20 Q. Give me all the ads that you are
- 21 referring to.
- 22 A. There were some like that for a product
- 23 called Melaire. There was period where all of the
- 24 ads listed tar and nicotine content.
- 25 g. I want to know all the ads you can

```
229
    Kassarjian - direct
    recall for that period:
 1
                    I've just given all the ads I can
 2
    recall.
 3
                 That was for ten, fifteen years ago?
 5
           '72 to '83. As it turns out, since Pollay
    does not interpret those, does not give it any
 7
    meaning, the comment is irrelevant.
                There are no comments with regard to
 8
    pages 16 through 19.
 9
10
          No, no problem.
                You have the revised version?
11
          Right.
12
13
                MR. EDELL: Mark this, please.
                 (Kassarjian Exhibit 4 marked for
14
15
    identification.)
                I show you what has been marked
16
    Kassarjian 4. Turn to page five, please,
17
    left-hand column. What does it say?
18
          I wrote on the edge, "Sloppy-use libraries
19
    and color Merox or 35 millimeter slides or color
20
21
    photos."
              On the bottom, "Sloppy but okay."
22
                What does that mean?
23
          What he did was to go running around and try
    to buy magazines. He chose two things, Life and
24
    Look because he wanted the actual magazine.
25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
    he gone to libraries and used color xeroxing which
    does a beautiful job or 30 milimeter slides, he
    could have had a better sample than two magazines
    which stopped publication in the middle of his
    study and two publications were very specific
    middle class publications.
                               He had nothing like
    Cosmopolitan, nothing like New Yorker in there so
    if I were doing it, I would have been more
    concerned about having a distribution of
 9
10
    magazines, a good distribution of magazines, and
    if I couldn't buy them, then I would just either
11
    color Xerox them or make color photographs of the
12
    slides and use those.
                           He felt it was more
13
    important to have the actual magazines and risk
15
    the sampling, getting a good sample of ads.
                Is that a serious flaw?
          Q.
16
17
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
10
    the question.
          It depends on what one does with it.
19
    depends what claims you will make for the
20
21
    results.
             Otherwise not.
22
                What types of claims would you believe
   render this sampling to be flawed?
23
          Any time you are talking or implying that
24
```

25

408 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 301 734 8446

this sampling is a representative sample of

```
231
     Kassarjian - direct
     magazines, that this is what the information
  1
  2
     environment was really like, no, no, no. This is
     what Look and Life were like while they
  3
     published.
                 If you want to talk about a sample of
  5
     all the magazine ads in the world and if that's
     what you imply you've got here, then it's a
  6
  7
     problem. If you don't do that, then no problem
     and they don't do that. They make no
     interpretation or claims about the study.
     are letting you do that.
 10
                 What were the demographics of Life and
 11
     Look during this time period?
 12
           I don't know.
                          It was just main line middle
 13
 14
     class.
                 What was Rose Cipollone?
 15
 16
           I have no idea who Rose Cipollone is.
                 You don't know whether she was main
 17
     line middle class or not?
 18
 19
           I don't even know what state she lived in.
 20
                 Page six.
           Just piddling around with the data here.
 21
     to 60 ads missing." That's 50 to 60 ads missing.
. 22
     Somehow he shipped all these things to Canada and
 23
```

the customs officials wouldn't let it through and

a big hunk of his ads disappeared in customs and I

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    guess it was in there that they were missing.
 1
                "Ceased publication," I thought that
 2
    was a poor choice. Of all the magazines to use,
 3
 4
    use two of them that ceased publication during
 5
    your study. Use Time. Here I said the same thing
    as I said before, here is a distribution of
 6
 7
    magazines, for example, that was a little wider,
    covered more people. He covered about 182 issues
 A
    with 31 missing cells. That is, there were some
 9
10
    years he couldn't find the magazines and used
    magazine dealers and never thought of going to the
11
    library and photographing them or didn't. That's
12
         Just piddling with his data.
13
14
                Are you aware of any content analysis
15
    of advertising during the period of 1938 to '83
    that included a larger sampling of ads than this
16
17
    study?
18
          Any conceivable content analyses?
                There may be dozens of them?
19
20
          No.
21
                Have you ever reviewed an article
    which was written as a result of a survey of ads
22
    during the period 1938 through 1983?
23
          Your question was do I know of any survey
24
```

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 57052 201-731-9688

that used a larger number of ads.

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 Q. Largest sampling of ads.
- 2 A. Does it mean ads or --
- Q. Advertisements.
- 4 A. There were a number of studies, many studies
- 5 out there. You are asking me if I can remember
- 6 how many ads in each study were seen and if any of
- 7 | those were greater than this one. I don't know.
- 8 Q. Do you know whether or not the
- 9 advertising that appeared in Life and Look was the
- 10 same advertising carried by the New Yorker,
- 11 Cosmopolitan and these other magazines or whether
- 12 | it was different?
- 13 A. If it's the same, then that helps my
- 14 concern. If it's different, then my concern is
- 15 serious. I don't know that. I will know it when
- 16 I see his worksheets, if I ever see his
- 17 | worksheets.
- 18 Q. Did you inquire of any of the
- 19 defundants whether or not their advertising
- 20 differed from Life and Look as it compared to
- 21 these other magazines that you listed?
- 22 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
- 23 | the question?
- 24 A. I have asked the defendants nothing about
- 25 their advertising.

waga and spinelli

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|-----|--|
| 1 | Q. Did-they turn furnish you any |
| 2 | information with regard to their advertising? |
| 3 | A. I have seen nothing from the defendants |
| 4 | regarding their advertising. I have listed to you |
| 5 | everything that I've seen already. |
| 6 | Q. The only advertising that you were |
| . 4 | furnished by the defendants were these ads here, |
| 8 | right? |
| 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | MR. EDELL: Let's mark this as |
| 11 | Kassarjian Exhibit 5. |
| 12 | (Kassarjian Exhibit 5 marked for |
| 13 | identification.) |
| 14 | Q. These ads that we marked as Kassarjian |
| 15 | Exhibit 5, do you know how they were chosen? |
| 16 | A. I have no idea. All of a sudden I had them |
| 17 | and I figured somebody is going to say bring |
| 18 | everything you ever saw so I brought them. I |
| 19 | don't know where they came from, why I got them or |
| 20 | what they mean. |
| 21 | Q. You don't know what they are |
| 22 | representative of? |
| 23 | A. No. |
| 24 | Q. Page seven. |
| 25 | A. Page seven, "What happened to duplicate |

ads." I wonder what he did when an ad appeared 1 2

Kassarjian - direct

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

25

that.

. 22

The next comment is Later he explains it.

"Canadian and probably Indians," probably some 3

Indians when he is talking about graduate students

I felt at this point and I've discussed that. 5

that I began to worry about was he prejudicing his

judges from the way he recruited them and the way 7

he instructed them and the way he sorted them out

and that's what these comments are. 9

At one point he says, for example, "Entirely educated in English" but Indian students would be entirely educated in English.

It says "Key bias of topic." does that mean?

I don't remember what that means. that. It's where I began to worry about was he biasing his judges. That's all.

In what way was he biasing his judges? By all the instructions, by telling them what it's about, telling them it's about major court proceedings, it's open to smokers. an enormous amount of sorting out. They had to be over 21, they had to do this, they had to do

You think that's not proper?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters -

Kassarjian - direct

3

. 22

23

1 MR.-BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of 2 the question.

- A. I would not have done it that way.
- 4 Q. My question is do you think that in your opinion was improper?
- 6 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of the question.
- 8 A. I don't know what improper means. I don't
 9 know if there's bias there. I answered that
 10 before by saying I don't know if there's bias.
- 11 Q. From the instructions and the
 12 information that you've seen, you can't determine
 13 whether or not there is bias?
- 14 A. It's a problem that I worry about. I hope 15 that sometime we can sort that out if this is 16 going to go any further.
- 17 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether 18 or not the study was biased?
- 19 A. Yes, there's biases in the study. How 20 important those biases are, I don't have an 21 opinion on yet.
 - Q. What biases are in the study?

 A. There's all types of biases, from the way
 you instruct your judges to who the judges are,
 the fact that only two judges were used for a

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
    product, not the same judges judged health and
    judged vitality and judged male-female.
    were not the same judges judging those
    characteristics so I don't know if there's
    interjudge disagreement across categories.
                                                 The
 5
    potential for bias is there. Whether it's biased
    or not to the point of being a fatal flaw, I don't
 7
    know.
                I'm not asking you about the
 9
          Q.
    potentials for bias. What biases are you aware of
10
    in this study as we sit here today?
11
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
12
    the question.
13
          I'm telling you I think there's the
    potential for bias here and there.
                                        I don't know
15
    what biases exist today.
16
                Page eight.
17
          Comment, "Irrelevant, gloss for layean."
18
    Just some comment he made that I thought, he threw
19
    someone out because their mother died of
20
    secondhand smoke in the workplace. Oh, come on.
21
   That may impress the client but it isn't
22
    impressing me. The judges used were not peers in
23
    the sense of peer. He makes it appear that he
21
   tried very hard to get a jury of judges that are
```

```
238
     Kassarjian - direct
     peers. They were not peers of these people.
  1
  2
     were not peers of Rose Cipollone.
                                         These are
     Canadian students and on the average in the mid
  3
     twenties of age and that is not a peer for these
  5
     products.
                 That's all.
                  Is it your testimony that the only way
  7
     to perform this content analysis was to have
     gotten judges similar to Rose Cipollone?
  9
           Absolutely not. Exactly the opposite.
                  Is it your testimony that the study is
 10
     flawed because of the judges who were used in the
 11
 12
     study?
                  MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
 13
     the question.
 14
           It is not flawed because of that reason.
 15
     However, it is Mr. Pollay that makes a big issue
 16
 17
     of how his judges are representative and I'm
 18
     claiming his judges are not representative.
 19
     not saying they should be.
 20
     should be.
 21
           Q.
                 Read the rest of the handwriting on
22
     the page.
           On the side I have, "Thinks he is pretty
 23
                  It sounds like he thinks he is pretty
     important."
 25
     important.
                 frying to be a lawyer arguing a case
```

```
rather than acting like an impartial scientist."
 1
 2
    I picked that all up on a phrase. "This panel of
    17 judges, like many juries, is an interesting and
 3
    diverse assortment of individuals. I don't know
    what lawyers call it but it sounds like that
 5
    argument they have at the end of the case when
 7
    they rant and rave to the jury and smile at them
    and giggle at them and so on.
                                   He is acting like a
 9
    lawyer.
            Act like a scientist.
10
                Would you continue reading what's on
11
    the page.
           "Not peers in education."
12
13
    all graduate students.
                            If being a peer is
    important -- I don't know claim it is -- but if it
14
15
    is important, then he should have been worried
    about the fact that his judges were not the same
16
17
    education as the average person. What I'm again
16
    trying to find out is the age, how old they would
    have been at the time of the surgeon general's
19
```

on the bottom I've written, "If all this is important," and again I'm not saying it is important, but if it's important, then the age biases and the cultural biases are severe problems. Next page I have judges were not blind

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

20

21

. 22

23

24

25

report.

Kassarjian - direct

```
Kassarjian - direct .
    to the purpose of the study.
 1
                You don't know that, though, do you?
 2
               I'm assuming that. Wait a minute.
          No.
 3
    I do know that. I have the instructions read to
    the judges and it's pretty strong, pretty damn
 5
    strong. He tells them what it's about.
                                              He tells
    them that they are going to be dragged in front of
    a high court, that they are going cross-examined
    and horrible things are going to happen to you,
 9
    now do the job.
10
                You think that flaws the study, sir?
11
          Q.
                                Object to the form of
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
12
    the question.
13
          I think it is a flaw in the study.
                                                Whether
14
    it's a fatal flaw or not, I don't know.
15
16
                You don't have an opinion?
          Not with the data I have.
17
                What would you need to look at in
18
    order to determine whether or not it was a fatal
19
20
    flaw?
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Object to the form of
21
    the question.
22
          To do anything with a study, one must see
23
    the total package of goods, I want to see the
24
```

questionnaires, I want to see what the judges

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

Kassarjian - direct

7

9

10

11

12

24

25

filled out, I want to see his early analyses, I
want to see the memos that went back and forth on
what he was supposed to look for and so on. You
have to see the whole package, not something
that's been prepared and carefully culled for
presentation.

- Q. When you review articles on content analysis in journals, are all these preliminary worksheet information contained in the journals?

 A. I want to give you an answer to that question and it will go off on a tangent and I don't know if you want me to do that.
- 13 Q. All I want you to do is answer the 14 question.
- There are two approaches to truth. 15 16 what we call the scientific method. The other is what we call the advocacy method. 17 In the advocacy method, the philosophy is that two biased 18 representatives will present data with bias, each 19 20 trying to make the strongest case for their side 21 to a third party, a judge or a jury, and the judge . 22 hearing both biased cases, designed to be one-sided, will be able to approach and touch the 23

In scientific research, the assumption is

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9466

truth. That's advocacy research.

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    that a scientist will do his dandest not to have
    any bias at all. Everything he presents is
 2
    absolutely honest, whether it's favorable to his
 3
    case or not favorable to his case, and that
 5
    anything he writes on paper can be fully accepted
 6
    as being highly credible. If he lies, terrible
7
    things happen to him. He gets drummed out of the
            Therefore, you can believe everything a
    court.
9
    scientist says.
10
```

In the advocacy position, you must listen to both sides before you can come out to what the truth is. We don't have the same demands on scientific research that go into the journals as we do on advocacy research because we know in advocacy research, the material has been carefully prepared to present one side of the story and not the other. With scientific research, we assume the scientist is an honest man and has presented both sides, so this is advocacy research and therefore we need to see everything since it has been designed to prove a point.

Q. When you say this is advocacy research, you're referring to Professor Pollay.

Is that correct?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

22

A. That's right.

waga and spinelli cartified shorthand reporters

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|----|--|
| | • |
| 1 | Q. Your work in this case, is that |
| 2 | advocacy work? |
| 3 | A. Yes, of course. |
| 4 | Q. Therefore, we have to look at |
| 5 | everything that you've done because you are |
| 6 | biased. Is that correct? |
| 7 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of |
| 8 | the question. |
| 9 | A. That's why you'll be cross-examining me. |
| 10 | Q. Is that correct? |
| 11 | HR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of |
| 12 | the question. |
| 13 | A. That's why you'll be cross-examining me. |
| 14 | That's the purpose of advocacy procedures. Both |
| 15 | sides present their sides. The expert witness as |
| 16 | scientist, which I'm trying to be, does his |
| 17 | damnedest to present it as he sees it to be true. |
| 16 | It is your job in advocacy research to try to tear |
| 19 | me apart and it is Mr. Bleakley's job to tear your |
| 20 | witness apart because we are playing with a |
| 21 | different set of rules when we are on your |
| 22 | territory than when we are on my territory. |
| 23 | g. Where did you come to this |
| 24 | information, sir? |

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9886

Object to the form of

```
Kassarjian - direct
  1
     the question.
           You want my opinion? I gave it to you.
  2
                 Where did you come up with this
  3
     information? Did you learn it from the scientific
     journals or from the lawyers you work with?
  5
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
  6
  7
     the question.
           That is my opinion on the differences
  8
     between advocacy research and scientific research.
                  What do you base that on?
 10
           I base that on my own knowledge of both
 11
     types of research.
 12
                  of being an expert in litigation
 13
     matters over the last ten, fifteen years?
 14
 15
                  MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
 16
     the question.
 17
           Yes.
                  Working with lawyers in cases?
 18
                                 Object to the form of
                  MR. BLEAKLEY:
 19
     the question.
 20
 21
                  Is that correct?
           ge are talking about a philosophical
. 22
                 That's all I'm presenting to you.
 23
     position.
     it or leave it.
 24
                  What leads you to conclude that the
 25
```

```
245
     Kassarjian - direct
     work performed by Professor Pollay is not
  1
  2
     scientific work?
  3
           It's paid for and signed, sealed and
     delivered to an attorney on one side of this case.
  5
           Q.
                  Therefore, it's not scientific?
                  MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
  6
     the question.
  7
  8
           I didn't say that.
                                I said it was advocacy
     research.
                  What do you base your statement on
 10
     that it's not scientific?
 11
           It was paid for, signed, sealed and
 12
 13
     delivered to an interested party.
 14
                  And, therefore, it's not scientific?
 15
           I didn't say that. I said therefore, it's
     advocacy research.
 16
                  I understand that. Can it still be
 17
     scientific if it's advocacy work?
           I don't know unless I can see the man's
 19
 20
     worksheets. That's why I want to see the
                   I don't know if this stuff has been
 21
     worksheets.
                      I just don't know.
· 22
     padded or not.
                  Are you aware that the defendants have
 23
           Q.
     in their possession copies of all of the
 24
```

advertising that was reviewed in this matter?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
246
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
          I have no idea who has what.
 2
    any of it.
          ٥.
                Could you attempt to replicate the
 3
    work done by Professor Pollay?
 5
          I would not do it.
                Why?
          Q.
 7
          Because I don't like the approach he used.
    I prefer my own approach.
 8
 9
                Did you attempt to conduct any content
10
    analysis with respect to the advertising that was
    used by Professor Pollay?
          I just told you I don't have it.
12
13
                I told you the defendants have it
14
15
    also.
16
          I don't know who has it.
                                     I don't have it.
17
                Were you asked to perform a content
          Q.
18
    analysis?
19
          No.
20
                Would it be important to attempt to
    see whether or not Professor Pollay's work is
21
    valid by performing a similar content analysis for
22
23
    ads during the same period?-
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
24
25
   the question.
```

Kassarjian - direct

- 1 A. I would not recommend it.
- 2 Q. Why is that?
- 3 A. I think it's a waste of money. There's not
- 4 enough data that has come out of it to be
- 5 worthwhile.
- 6 Q. In other words, you said that
- 7 | financially it's not worth it but would an attempt
- 8 to perform a content analysis on ads, cigarette
- 9 ads for the same period of time give you a better
- 10 insight as to the validity of Professor Pollay's
- Il work?
- 12 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
- 13 the question.
- 14 A. I would not conduct it in the same way so I
- 15 | would not replicate it this way. I would do it
- 16 differently.
- 17 Q. How would you do it?
- 18 | 1. I can't create an ad under these
- 19 conditions. I can't create an experimental design
- 20 under these conditions.
- 21 Q. You had a lot of time to think about
- 22 it. You went through two reports by Professor
- 23 Follay which detailed a content analysis. You
- 24 spent a lifetime doing work in consumer behavior
- 25 including content analysis and you can't tell us

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

- 1 how you would devise a content analysis of the ads
- 2 | which is the subject matter of this litigation?
- 3 A. But be careful. I don't know what the
- 4 subject matter of this study is. What is it you
- 5 want to know? I don't know that. These things
- 6 take a long time to develop and you want me to do
- 7 it in fifteen minutes. I can't.
- 8 Q. You've had more than fifteen minutes
- 9 to think about the content analysis in this case,
- 10 haven't you?
- 11 A. I've had about a minute to think about what
- 12 study I would design. Up to now I've been reading
- 13 the study, mostly trying to understand it and then
- 14 trying to see if I have any objection to it. Not
- 15 how I would redesign it.
- 16 Q. Is there anything that was done right
- 17 in this study?
- 18 A. Lots of things. This is a good study. I'm
- 19 not bitching about this study. It's okay. What
- 20 we are doing is we are playing with piddly little
- 21 details about what he writes. I don't know what
- 22 he says. It doesn't ad a damn thing to either
- 23 side I don't think. I have no problem with the
- 24 study.
- 25 Q. Page 11.

```
249
    Kassarjian - direct
          "Color or black and white."
 1
                                        He used. 35
                  I don't know if they are color or
 2
 3
    black and white Xeroxing.
                Were you aware that Professor Pollay's
    deposition was taken?
          I think I heard that but I wasn't sure.
 7
                Do you know whether or not any of
    these details that you are talking about here were
8
    given by Professor Pollay during his deposition?
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Object to the form of
10
11
    the question.
12
          I don't know.
13
                Did you ask to see the deposition
    transcript?
14
          I wasn't even sure there was one.
15
                But the lawyers didn't give it to you,
16
    did they?
17
          No, they did not.
18
                Page 13.
19
                        Used a computer." He said he
20
    took his data and put it on a computer.
21
    "Remarkable, used a computer."
                                     on the right-hand
22
    side, "Scary detail."
23
                Too detailed?
24
```

Don't bother wasting my time

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
    giving me all this detail. You punched it-into
    the computer twice.
                         Who cares. If you are a
 2
    scientist, I assume you did it right. If you are
 3
    doing advocacy research, then I want to see what
    you actually did. Don't waste my time. That's
 5
    all that is.
 6
 7
                Page 14.
          Q.
          It says, "It is essential that we see all
 8
    the data, worksheet, preliminary drafts,
 9
    interpretations, et cetera."
                                  I've already
10
    answered that.
11
12
          Q.
                Page 15.
          15, this stuff is not intended for Pollay
13
    who I also know quite well.
                                  It's just notes I
1 4
    wrote to myself and I say here he talks about the
15
    coincidence of content so I wrote, "Come on!"
16
    That's jargon squared.
17
                You know Professor Pollay?
18
19
                You didn't know he was a curator of
20
    Archives of Advertising?
21
          Sure, I knew. I don't know what curator
22
            I don't know what he does but I knew he
    called himself the curator.
24
```

Do you know what Professor Pollay's

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
251
    Kassarjian - direct
    reputation is with respect to content analysis?
 1
 2
           He has done some; in fact, maybe even
 3
    published one of his papers in my journal.
    work is okay.
                   As I said, this work is okay, too.
 5
    It's different than I would do it but it's okay.
    It's all right.
 6
 7
                 When was the the last time you did a
 8
    content analysis?
 9
          I, me?
10
                 Yes.
          I just finished one now.
11
                                      I presented it?
12
    June of 1987.
13
                 Regarding what material?
14
          The impact of regulation on the content of
15
    advertising, how regulation impacted on what was
    being said in ads.
16
17
                 That was done for scientific purposes?
18
          It was done to get a publication so I could
19
    get a raise and get promoted and become famous.
20
                Can you continue on page 15?
21
          I said wonderful.
                              "This is a full attribute
22
    by attribute matrix."
                           I thought isn't that a
23
    wonderful mouthful of jarcon.
                                    Wonderful.
24
    all.
```

There's more on the page.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Q.

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
          Later on I said, "So what, what is the
    interpretation." Here he is talking about
 2
    something, whatever it is, but he doesn't
 3
    interpret his results at all so you are giving us
 5
    all of this detail on what Table 3 means and how
    to interpret Table 3, what's in what column, so my
· 7
    comment is isn't that wonderful, a whole table
    full of numbers, so what, what do the numbers
           Interpret the data. Tell us what the
    numbers mean. He carefully avoids that.
10
                Page 16?
11
           "So what does this show about influence of
12
           Again on Table 4 he is talking about the
13
    cases, the number of times that some kinds of ads
14
15
    appear, that is, positive health ads, negative
    heads ads, what he calls positive and negative
16
    health ads, liveliness ads, that is, that's the
17
    macho type ads, and the pure scene, which is a
18
    picture of a mountain. He combines those four
19
20
    into a single category in Table 4, says he did
    that on page 16, never tells us what he means.
21
22
                Why did you combine them, what does
    the combination mean, what is it all about.
23
```

never interprets and my suspicion is he was told

not to interpret because this is what you mean by

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

```
253
    Kassarjian - direct
    advocacy type research. You never tell the other
    side anything, you make them stretch for it, get
 3
    it themselves, whereas in a scientific paper, you
    interpret your data, you tell us what it means so
    we can look it over.
                How do you know that?
 7
          How do I know what?
                How do you know that that's the way
 8
    experts conduct themselves in litigation?
 9
10
          I have experience both as a editor and as an
    author of scientific research. I probably
11
    examined, over the last twenty years I've seen
12
13
    many, many studies that were done for purposes of
    advocacy.
                In the journals?
15
          Not in the journals, no.
16
17
                In what? Involved in litigation in
18
    which you've acted as an expert?
19
          Sometimes when I'm an expert and sometimes
20
    when I'm not.
21
                Is that how you prepare your
22
    information when you are acting as an expert
23
    witness?
                              Object to the form of
24
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
25
    the question.
```

```
254
    Kassarjian - direct
          We are not talking about expert witness.
 1
    are talking about research. We are not talking of
 2
 3
    my opinion. We are talking of research.
    not confuse those two facts because they are quite
    different.
 5
                Did you prepare a report in this
 7
    matter?
          I did not.
                You know a report was prepared which
 9
    memorializes your opinions. Correct?
10
          I have no idea if someone wrote a report --
11
    a report on my opinion?
12
                Yes.
13
          Q.
          I have never seen such a thing.
    statement, a one-page statement, that says what I
15
    am going to testify to. If you are calling that
16
    one-page statement a report, fine. If there's
17
18
    anything else, I don't have the vaguest idea what
19
    you are talking about.
20
                MR. EDELL:
                            Would you mark this,
21
    please.
22
                (Kassarjian Exhibit 6 marked for
23
    identification.)
                Have you ever seen Kassarjian Exhibit
24
          Q.
25
    6 for identification before, the first page
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
    specifically?
 1
 2
          (Examining document.) Yes.
                                        This is not a
 3
    report. This is what I meant by a one-page
    statement.
 5
                Did you advise the lawyers for the
    defendants in this matter of other opinions not
 7
    contained in Kassarjian Exhibit 6?
 8
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
    the question.
 9
          I didn't understand what you said.
10
                Prior to meeting with the lawyers in
11
    this case in preparation for this deposition, did
12
    you advise any of the lawyers of any opinions
13
    which are not contained in Kassarjian Exhibit 6
14
    for identification?
          Did I say anything else besides these 150
16
    words? I must have.
17
18
                Express any opinions.
          I probably talked to the various attorneys
19
    for several hours. In those several hours, I
20
   probably used up, at the rate I talk, 50,000
21
   words. Is there anything that was in those 50,000
22
    words that is not represented here? I'll be
23
    damned if I know.
24
25
                Do you think that Kassarjian Exhibit 6
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
    fairly and accurately represents all of the
    opinions that you have with regard to this matter
    and the factual basis for those opinions?
 3
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
 5
    the question.
          I don't understand what you are asking.
 7
    sorry. Does this represent every opinion I have
    about everything? Hell, no.
                That isn't what I said.
          Ō.
    Kassarjian 6 fairly and accurately reflect those
10
    opinions and the factual basis for the opinions
    that you have with regard to this matter?
12
13
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
    the question.
15
          I don't know what factual basis means.
                                                   This
    accurately does represent my opinion. I have no
    idea what a factual basis means.
17
                Are there any opinions that you have
18
          Q.
    concerning this case that are not contained in
19
    Kassarjian 6?
20
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
21
22
    the question.
          I don't know. I have opinions on lots of
23
    things. If people ask me, I'll tell them.
```

We have to pull it out of you?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Q.

25

```
257
    Kassarjian - direct
 1
                 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
 2
    the question.
 3
                If you want my opinion on Fresident
    Reagan, I'll tell you.
 5
                I have to pull it out of you with
 6
    regard to this litigation.
                                 We have to go through
 7
    this advocacy procedure. Right?
 8
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
 9
    the question.
10
          ٥.
                Correct?
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
11
12
    the question.
          I don't understand.
13
14
                You don't understand what we are
15
    talking about?
16
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Is that a question?
                Do you understand what I mean by this
17
18
    advocacy proceeding?
19
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
20
    the question.
21
          You are up in the upper atmosphere.
22
    bring it down to my level.
                                 What is it you want me
23
    to answer?
24
                All I wanted you to do was be truthful
    and responsive.
```

```
258
     Kassarjian - direct
  1
                 MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                 Is that a question?
                 MR. EDELL:
  2
                             No.
                                   He asked me and I
     responded to his question, Mr. Bleakley.
 3
                 MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                I just wanted to make
 5
    sure you weren't expecting an answer.
 6
                 MR. EDELL:
                             I'm sure you could have
 7
    heard it.
 8
           ٥.
                 Turn to page 17 of Kassarjian Exhibit
 9
10
          Yes.
                 Could you read your comments, sir?
11
12
           "Good numbers." I like the looks of those
    reliability figures. They are nice high numbers.
13
14
    Very, very good stuff.
                             On the bottom I said, "A
15
    bit inflated. Duplicate ads are counted but
    effect is minimized." Then I try to show that
17
    there were about 57 duplicate ads and that would
18
    kick up and inflate the numbers but later he said
    he threw those duplicate ads out and so I crossed
19
20
    off the consent.
21
                Turn to page 18.
22
          Yes.
23
                Give us your consents that are
    contained on page 19.
```

1938 to 42, I just wrote the word prewar

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
         That meant advertising before World War II.
    For the 1953 to 1959, I wrote self-destruct era,
 2
    so that's what I meant as the self-destruct area
 3
    where there was an awful lot of health claims that
 5
    were pointing out to people that cigarettes were
    so hot.
 7
                Tell me about the ads.
                                Object to the form of
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
 8
 9
    the question.
          I already did.
10
                Do you recall any of the specific ads
11
    other than those that you've given to us so far?
12
          There were many ads at this time that in one
13
    way or the other talked about either -- this is
14
    before tar and nicotine -- that talked about not a
15
    cough in the carload, T-17, constantly talking
16
    about the fact that their product was less
17
    irritating than a competitor's product. When you
18
    say mine is less irritating than the competitor's
19
    product, the message that you are giving is they
20
    are all irritating and mine is less so.
21
                You recall these ads?
22
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Object to the form of
23
24
    the question.
          I don't recall all of the ads that were
25
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
    developed, all 500 or whatever ads Mr. Pollay
 1
 2
          I've not seen those ads.
                                     I don't recall
 3
    them.
                You recall the ads you just related to
          Q.
    us, the T-zone ad?
 5
          Yes.
 6
 7
                You recall not a cough in the carload?
 8
          Yes.
 9
                How many years ago were those ads?
          I don't know when they were run but it was
10
    about this period.
11
                On page, not numbered, Table 3, you
12
          Q.
    circled two numbers.
13
          I was just trying to understand what the
14
15
    hell those are. Nothing.
                Page 20, would you read to us your
16
          Q.
17
    comments.
                "Filter, tar" next to the years 1970
18
    through 1983 and then I went back and added in
19
    1968. I believe this was the period, I believe
20
    this was the period when the filter and tar ads
21
    appeared, smoke our product because it's filtered
22
    or the listing of the tars and I feel these ads
23
    again helped warn people of the dangers of smoking
24
25
   cigarettes.
```

Kassarjian - direct

Q. This is based upon your general impression of the ads; no scientific content analysis. Is that correct?

4 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of the question.

A. That's correct.

7 Q. Can you read your comments on the 8 bottom of page 20?

A. This is where I was trying to understand what the numbers mean. What Dr. Follay did was to take health, that is, positive health, where it claims it's healthy to smoke cigarettes, reduces tension, the negative ads which say cigarette smoking will kill you but your product is better than a competing product, what he called lively, that is, these are the athletic, vim, macho ads and he combined with them the pure scene ads, the picture of a mountain or fresh air, combined them altogether, added them up and listed them and I was trying to understand what the combination could possibly mean and he never told us, never interpreted it.

Q. You're assuming that there were some of these negative ads in this content analysis.

Is that correct?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

| | K | à | 8 | \$ | à | r | 1 | i | 2 | n | - | d | 1 | I | • | ¢ | t |
|--|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

- 1 A. No. It isn't I'm assuming. That's his instructions. It comes from his instructions.
- Q. If there is a negative statement with 4 regard to health, that was to be included?
- 5 A. As a health ad. Any statement that involved 6 health in any form or manner was to be included.
- 7 Q. Do you have any other opinions with 8 respect to Professor Follay's content analysis 9 that you haven't conveyed to us?
- 10 A. Not that I can think of at this point.
- 11 Q. Do you have any opinions with respect
 12 to Dr. Cohen's opinions that you haven't told us
 13 about?
- 14 A. Not that I can remember at this time.
 - Q. Did you review Dr. Cohen's notes?
- 16 A. I don't have any idea what Dr. Cohen's notes
- 17 are. In his deposition he talks about he has
- 18 several hundred pages of notes he prepared for his
- 19 attorney. Maybe that's you. I've never seen
- 20 those notes. I don't know what they are, if
- 21 that's what you are talking about.
- 22 Q. Did you review any opinion surveys?
- 23 A. No, I did not.

15

24 g. What effects do advertising ads have?
25 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Kassarjian - direct
 1
    the question.
 2
                MR. EDELL:
                            Maybe it's getting late in
 3
    the day.
              I'll try again.
                What effect does advertising have on
    consumers?
 5
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
 6
 7
    the question.
          That's too much question.
                                      That's too broad
 8
    a question to be answerable.
 9
                What effect does cigarette advertising
10
    have on consumers of cigarettes?
11
12
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
    the question.
13
          It's simply too broad for me to manage
14
15
          Ask a specific question.
                Do cigarette advertisements have the
16
    ability to persuade consumers with regard to any
17
    attributes of cigarette smoking?
18
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
19
20
    the question.
          I can't handle a question like that.
21
    too broad. Any attributes? Have you seen any
    opinion surveys with regard to the public's
23
    impression of cigarette advertising insofar as it
   relates to health?
```

```
Kassarjian - direct
```

don't remember.

- 1 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of 2 the question.
- A. I have been presented with no public opinion surveys for these hearings. If they may have appeared in the paper a bunch of years ago under a Gallup poll or something, I may have seen it but I
- 9 or not warnings would have contributed to the information environment regarding cigarette smoking and health had they been provided by cigarette manufacturers in the 1940s?
- MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of the question.
- 15 A. I don't know what that question means. Too l6 many ifs in it.
- 17 Q. Have you had any doctoral students?
- 18 A. Yes.

. 7

- 19 Q. Have you had any doctoral students who 20 have written papers in the area of cognitive
- 21 | dissonance?

25

- 22 A. Joel Cohen.
- 23 Q. Other than Joel_Cohen?
- 24 A. Not that I recall.
 - Q. Can information affect behavior?

waga and spinelli . . certified shorthand reporters

| | Kassarjian - direct |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of |
| 2 | the question. |
| 3 | A. Can information affect behavior? Of |
| 4 | course. If I tell you that Tylenol is going to |
| 5 | kill you dead, you are going to stop using it. |
| 6 | Q. In what way does information affect |
| 7 | behavior? |
| 8 | A. I just told you. I gave you an example. |
| 9 | Q. You gave me an example but you didn't |
| 10 | tell me how in scientific terms it affects |
| 11 | behavior. |
| 12 | A. I have no idea. I don't think that that's |
| 13 | known. I don't think it will be known for many |
| 14 | Years. |
| 15 | MR. EDELL: Let's take a short break. |
| 16 | (Short break.) |
| 17 | (Deposition concluded at 5:20 p.m.) |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | • |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | • |
| 24 | |

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9668

JURAT 1 2 I, HAROLD H. KASSARJIAN, do hereby certify that I have read the foregoing transcript 3 of my testimony, taken on October 28, 1987, and 5 have signed it subject to the following changes: CORRECTION PAGE LINE 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 DATE: 21 22 NOTARY PUBLIC 23 24 25.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 2

3

•

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

25

I, MARGARET J. TEILHABER, a Certified

Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the States
of New York and New Jersey, do hereby certify that
prior to the commencement of the examination the
witness was sworn by me to testify the truth, the
whole truth and nothing but the truth.

I do further certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I do further certify that I am neither of counsel nor attorney for any party in this action and that I am not interested in the event nor outcome of this litigation.

Notary Public of the States of New Jersey

and New York Certificate Number X100856

New Jersey conmission expires August 7, 1991

New York registration No. 4741157

New York commission expires February 1990

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters